SOME MORE CONSIDERATIONS Proving the UNREASONABLENESS OF THE ROMANISTS IN Requiring us to Return TO THE COMMUNION of the Preſent Romiſh-Church.

By *William Squire.*

LONDON,
Printed for *H. M.* and ſold by *Peter Gillworth* Bookſeller at *New-Caſtle* in *Staffordſhire*, 1674.

CONSIDERATIONS

Proving the

UNREASONABLENESS

OF THE

ROMANISTS

IN

Refusing to Return

TO

COMMUNION

of the Present

Romish-Church.

BRITISH MUSEUM 27 APR 53

By William Squire.

LONDON.

Printed by J. M. and sold by Peter Cole Bookseller at Nun-Calle in Sarf-

To the Honourable

Sir Robert Shirley Baronet.

Sir,

MAny Reaſons induce me to Dedicate theſe Papers to you, your own perſonal worth, your obliging carriage, and great civilities to all who are honoured with your acquaintance: But chiefly your zeal for Religion and Hereditary affection to the Church of *England.*

Sir, the reſtleſs indeavours of

the Romaniſts to reduce us to their Communion, call'd me into the Field; what ever my abilities are, I thought it my duty to contend for the Truth, at leaſt to Alarm others, that they may oppoſe the incroaching Enemy. If the Romaniſts were buſie in gaining Proſelytes, I ſaw no reaſon why we ſhould ſit ſtill; when they were uſing their Swords, it would be no prudence to keep ours in the Scabbard; if we judge our Cauſe good, it would be our ſhame to betray it by our ſilence, and we could never anſwer it before God or our own Conſciences, if we were not as zealous to oppoſe error, as they are to maintain it, and ſhew'd not as much care to weed up the Tares,

as they do to ſow them. On this ground I have publiſh'd ſome more Conſiderations to ſtay the wavering and prevent the back-ſliding of the Weak, by ſhewing the unreaſonableneſs of the Romaniſts in requiring our Communion with the preſent Romiſh Church. And now my judgement as well as affection prompts me to beg your Patronage of this Work, as being one whom I knew to be a true friend of the Proteſtant Clergy and a Patron of the Church, one that loved his Religion as well as profeſt it, and, which will be your comfort as well as credit, that honoured his Profeſſion by conſtant exerciſe of Devotion, and a good Converſation.

Sir, The continuance of your Health and Life, with the abundance of all Spiritual and Temporal blessings, is the hearty Prayer of

Your most unfeigned and faithful Servant,

March 13. 1672.

W. Squire.

THE

THE PREFACE.

SInce the Reformation from Popery, the Romiſh Party hath left no Stone unturned to reduce us to their Errors. There hath been wanting neither induſtry nor cunning to promote their Cauſe; they compaſs Sea and Land

to

to make Proſelytes; we meet with them in City and Country, in publick and private; whereever diſcontents or weakneſs, ignorance or unconſtancy gives them an opportunity, they are ſeldome abſent: we hear of them with the Sick in his Bed-chamber, with the Priſoner in the Jayl, with the Condemned at the Gallows, every where they are buſie to recontile men to the Romiſh Church. What number of Converts they have gained, I matter not to inquire; for neither is their Cauſe much credited, nor ours much impaired by many of them; it matters not what mens profeſſion is, if their practice be not anſwerable, and when men have been looſe Proteſtants, the Romaniſts gain little, if they become looſe Papiſts: if the principal reaſon of their converſion was Conſcience, and not deſign, I ſhould expect to find them as well reformed in their lives, as in their Judgments. He that ſeriouſly deſigns the ſaving of his Soul, would as equally leave his debauch'd courſes as ſome erroneous opinions, for thoſe do as much, or more than theſe, occaſion his damnation.

But

But when men are as bad as they were, I rather think that they take Popery for the eaſier way to enjoy their ſins here, and be ſaved hereafter. If theſe be the good Catholicks, who are hardly true Chriſtians, I envy them not ſuch Converts: he that lives an Atheiſt, we loſe not much if he turn Papiſt: he that underſtands little of any Religion, cannot much brag that he is of the Romiſh, nor can he be ſaid to change his Religion, that really never had any: we cannot ſay they went out from us, for they were not of us; if they neither cared to underſtand the ground of our Religion, nor to practiſe the duties: if they minded their pleaſure more than their devotion, and were indifferent in the exerciſe of that which they profeſt to be the truth, I cannot believe they were ever ours; and if they be no better, 'tis no great ground for a Triumph to call them theirs: 'tis a poor conqueſt to lead captive a ſilly woman laden with divers Luſts, to perſwade ſome diſcontented perſon to throw off his Religion in an anger at his Fortunes, to gain ſome humouriſt who

loves

loves a Faſhion by himſelf, and turns a Papiſt to be thought ſome body: or ſome ignorant perſon, who troubles himſelf with no more Religion than the Collier, to believe what the Church believes, and yet what the Church believes he knows not: ſhould they have more ſuch Converts, they may ſerve to increaſe their number, but they will hardly credit their Cauſe. If there be any ſerious underſtanding perſon, that (as he ſaith) out of a principle of Conſcience, and love of Truth, and deſire of Salvation entertains any favourable thoughts of the Romiſh Party, I would have him weigh impartially the true reaſons of our differences, and the ſubſtantial grounds of our refuſal to joyn with the preſent Romiſh Church. We put it to this iſſue, whether every Doctrine which their late Council of Trent *declares to be* de fide, *and which muſt be acknowledged for the Catholick Faith without which there is no Salvation, be a Divine Truth delivered by Chriſt or his Apoſtles? For if there be any thing required to be believed, it muſt be evident that it was firſt reveal-*

ed,

*ed, and if it cannot be made evident to us that it was revealed, then we have no reaſon to believe it is Gods Word; and if we have no reaſon to believe it is ſo, then if we profeſs that it is ſo, we bely God, we add to his Word, and we publiſh for Doctrine, what (for ought we know) are the Commandements of Men. If you will have communion with the Romiſh Church, then (ſay they) you muſt believe theſe things, and he that errs in any one Doctrine cannot believe truly the reſt, he doth loſe all Catholik Faith *. 'Tis not enough to judge them probable, or that they may be pioufly believed; but you muſt believe them as neceſſary Articles of Faith, and profeſs them to be ſuch. But now we deſire this may be weighed impartially, whether thoſe Doctrines which are their Additions to the Creed, and muſt be believed on pain of Damnation, have this evidence or no? If they have not this evidence, then we have no reaſon to believe them, and by conſequence are ſafe without the belief of them; if they have this evidence, then let us ſee it; if they have not this*

* Charity maintained by Catholick 6 ſect. 29.

this evidence, then at beſt they are uncertain and doubtful, founded on meer conjecture which cannot oblige us to a rational aſſent: If they have this evidence, and will produce it, then we ſhall ſee either that we are obliged to aſſent, if the evidence, be ſufficient or elſe that we are not in fault, if the evidence upon ſerious examination appear inſufficient. He that impoſes any thing on another Mans belief, muſt firſt prove what he requires to be believed, and till that be done, no man can be blamed for his diſſent, where he ſees no reaſon to aſſent. We bid none ſhut their eyes againſt the light, or oppoſe that which appears to be truth, but let them prove as clearly as they affirm ſtrongly, and no man that loves truth will think it any diſparagement to retract an error. We confeſs 'tis more ingenuous to confeſs and amend a fault than perſiſt in it; but then he that would perſwade another to amend a fault, muſt firſt prove it to be a fault, and till that be done, God will impute our miſtakes (if we do erre) to the weakneſs of our underſtandings, not any pravity of our wills.

Many

Many of the Doctrines which the Romaniſts impoſe on us, they tell us are not clear in Scripture without their Churches interpretation, unleſs the Church by the Spirit of Truth explains thoſe things which were before obſcure in Scripture; ſo ſaith Canus, (i. e.) *in effect to ſay, we cannot convince you out of Scripture, the Text is obſcure, unleſs you will believe our interpretation, and then 'tis clear; we can give you no ſufficient ground to believe, that this is the meaning of the place, but you muſt believe that is the meaning which we ſay is the meaning, though we do like the Gloſs interpret* ſtatuimus *by* abrogamus, *though the words will not bear that ſenſe which we put upon them. Thus we muſt renounce our own judgements, and believe they have an immediate revelation of the meaning of many places in Scripture, or elſe farewell many of thoſe Articles of Faith without which there is no Salvation. Again, many of theſe Doctrines (they ſay) are Traditions delivered down from the Apoſtles, and have been conſtantly held in their*

* Lo. Com. l. 3. c. 3. fundam. 2.

their Church, but this is ſtill to reſolve all into their own affirmation, they forſooth, muſt be the Keepers of this Tradition: if we would know what was delivered by the Apoſtles, we muſt not conſult the writings of the Primitive Times, but the Teſtimony of the preſent Church; which is in effect to ſay, all is Tradition what they call Tradition, and we muſt believe it, becauſe they ſay it. And is not this ſtrange that when we queſtion theſe Doctrines which they impoſe on us as Articles of Faith, and the lawfulneſs of many Rites and Ceremonies which they pretend are derived from Apoſtolical Tradition, that yet we muſt be content with this proof? There is little for it in Scripture, the Places are obſcure, but believe their Interpretation, and then it is proved enough. There is little appearance of theſe Apoſtolical Traditions, but believe their words and then you are ſure: Grant them this manner of proof, and all is done. Put out our own Eyes, renounce our Judgments, take all they ſay upon Truſt,

believe

believe all they require of us, and then we may ſoon turn Papiſts: But if no Party of Men can require any thing to be believed as neceſſary to Salvation without the evidence of a Revelation from God, and whoever requires any thing to be believed under pretence of a Revelation, muſt give ſome convincing Proof, that this thing was revealed; if the Council declare an Article to be de fide, *there muſt then be ſome proof that it was revealed: but till theſe Doctrines which they require us to believe, are proved to be from God, and that by a better argument than the bare teſtimony of the Impoſer, we have no reaſon to receive their Additions: Till we ſee on what ground the Council decreed theſe Doctrines to be believed, and whether thoſe Arguments by which they were convinced, were a ſufficient ground for their Decree, we have no reaſon to believe theſe Additions to the Creed. Others tell us we need look no further, than the Practice of the preſent Church, for either it*

hath been ſo conſtantly practiſed from the Apoſtles times, or elſe there muſt be ſome Age, which either might not know what was delivered in the Age immediately foregoing, or elſe did wilfully reſolve to deceive their Poſterity, in telling them that ſome thing they had received of their Forefathers which yet they had not received: and either of theſe things they think abſurd to imagine. We are told that by their way of conveying down their Doctrines by living Voice and Practice of the Church, (i. e.) *by Catechiſing, publick Preaching, private diſcourſing, and conſonant living, 'tis made ſo manifeſt to the generality what was held in each year immediately before, that no prejudice can make them all ſo mad as either to miſtake or miſinterpret it: So ſaith* I. S. * *And then ſtill we muſt take their words for true, and believe becauſe they ſay it. I queſtion whether they do not impoſe an Error, they tell me they do not, becauſe they have alwayes taught ſo: but why muſt I believe*

* Raillery againſt Reaſon Diſc. 16. pag. 152.

lieve they have alwayes taught ſo? they tell me, becauſe elſe there muſt be ſome Age in which they could not tell what had been taught them, or elſe that they would wilfully deceive thoſe that followed them: But ſo long as I ſee that Errors may creep in by degrees, and de facto *uſually do ſo, why ſhould I trouble my ſelf whether they were deceived themſelves firſt, or did wilfully deceive others? Plauſible diſcourſes ſignifie nothing againſt evidence of Fact. The Council of* Trent *acknowledges that in the Celebration of the Maſs many things had crept in* ſive temporum vitio, ſive hominum incuria & improbitate, quæ a tanti ſacrificii dignitate aliena ſunt, *whether by the fault of the times, or the negligence and perverſneſs of men, which were far from the dignity of that ſacrifice, and therefore bids the Biſhops to take away thoſe things which either Covetouſneſs or Irreverence, or Superſtition* (falſa imitatrix veræ pietatis) *had brought in: and now ſhall I ſay that no abuſes could come into the*

Seſſ. 22. Decr. de obſerv. & evitand.

*celebration of the Mass, because men could not be ignorant what was the custome of their immediate Predecessors, nor can be thought wilfully to impose on their Successors? when the Council confesses there are abuses, yea, and crept into that daily Sacrifice, which they esteem with the highest veneration and respect; and these also brought in under a pretence of Piety, and therefore less observed: But now if there were abuses crept into the Mass, abuses in Indulgences through Superstition, Ignorance or Irreverence *, if there might this sensible alteration happen in the Practice of the Church, I see no reason why there might not as well creep in an alteration in the Doctrine, and by degrees erroneous Opinions steal in to justifie those erroneous Practices. 'Tis then not enough to pretend the present Practice of the Church, unless we were first assured that it neither hath nor could practise otherwise, than it first received from Christ and his Apostles. If they prove the Doctrines they require us to believe have*

* Sess. 25. Decr. de Indulgent.

have been delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtle, then we are bound to receive them; otherwiſe their preſent practice is no warrant for us to believe theſe Additions: If they bring convincing arguments to ſatisfie our Judgements of the truth of theſe things, then to disbelieve theſe Doctrines would be our Sin, and not to return to their Communion would be our Crime. We put it to this iſſue; Since they would have us believe many things which we cannot find in the Scripture, nor in the Times immediately ſucceeding the Apoſtles; let them prove them: The Decrees of their Councils move us not any more than the Teſtimonies of men in their own Cauſe. Their expoſitions of doubtful places, we look upon as their own conjectures; their pretended Traditions are nothing to us, they may be Records of their own making, at beſt they are in their keeping, and whether they be true or falſe, corrupted or no they bring us no other proof than the Teſtimony of them who are Parties themſelves: we have

learnt to call no man on earth, Maſter, or take that for Goſpel, which any Sect, or Party of Men under what name ſoever impoſe on us. Let them prove what they require us to believe, and though we have erred we will not be Hereticks. Inſtead of theſe Arguments we meet with other dealing from the Romiſh Party, we meet with many plauſible inſinuations, arguments rather fitted to inveigle ignorant perſons, or thoſe who have neither leiſure nor ability to dive into the differences betwixt us, than to convince underſtanding mens arguments, which are more ſuited to the fancy than the reaſon, and ſometimes ſuch which may be ſuited to any Religion, to the Mahometan as well as Chriſtian, yea which aſſoon may make us of no Religion, as of any. I will give you a taſt of thoſe tricks and crafty inſinuations whereby they beguile ſome unſtable men. They tell them that we are Proteſtants in policy more than conſcience, that were it not for our preferments, for our Livings and our Wives, we would

would ſoon turn Papiſts. That we chooſe one Religion to live in, another to dye in, and therefore though we live Proteſtants, yet we commonly dye Papiſts.: there is one I. S. *that in a Treatiſe call'd* An Invitation to ſeek the Lord, &c. c. 21. *ſaith ſo. They tell them, that we never read their Authors, or know what their Doctrine is from their Writers, but take all on truſt, and ſecond hand from our own, and that none who read their Books can continue Proteſtants. If we write againſt their Errors, they tell them, that we do it not for love of Truth, but for Applauſe and Credit, for Profit and Preferment. There is one* I. S. *that ſaith ſo. As if none were zealous Proteſtants, but meer Politicians. Sometimes they pretend, that we faſten many Doctrines on them which they do not own, and forge Stories to make them odious, and never anſwer their Arguments but with Scoffs and Jeers. By theſe Inſinuations they make way for themſelves among weaker People. And when they*

have gained ſo far credit to their Stories, that the Engliſh Clergy are Men of no Conſcience nor learning, but meerly keep up the difference for Temporal Advantage; then they repreſent themſelves as the only Lovers of Truth, the only Mortified Perſons; the only Friends to Religion, who are zealous to Propagate it with their utmoſt Pains, and ſeal it with their Blood. They have ſo many Confeſſors, ſo many Martyrs, they can reckon up ſo many Saints: Whereas among Proteſtants ſaith Rushworth, *he knew many honeſt Men, but never any whom themſelves call'd holy Men. That in the Romiſh Church there is nothing but Faſting and Watching, ſevere Penances and Mortifications, Whippings and Scourgings, &c. Whereas the Proteſtants Preach up the Fleſh, Idleneſs and Pleaſures: Preach down good Works and cry up only Faith; Preach only an hatred of Sin out of Fear of Hell, not out of Love to God, &c. As for their Prieſts they brag of Demonſtrations, Abſolute Certainty and Infallibility,*

Infallibility, Sure and Certain Principles, whereas Proteſtanty is without Principles, they have no Infallible Teachers, and therefore do not believe infallibly, and therefore are uncertain of the Truth of what they believe; at beſt their Religion is founded on probabilities, and they have no aſſurance, but a moral certainty.

The Romiſh Party cry up the Church, The Church, as the Jews did the Temple, The Temple. Their Church is Noah's *Ark, and who ever will ſcape the Flood muſt come into it: Theirs is the Catholick Church which is profeſt in the Creed, we are but Hereticks, Schiſmaticks, without Faith, without Charity. And therefore either we muſt turn or be damned. With ſuch Arguments they aſſault many, and no wonder if Paper Pellets knock down ſome weak Perſons; thoſe that have not Time nor Brains to weigh ſolid Arguments, may be eaſily cozened with ſuperficial, and a petty fallacy may ſeem a Demonſtration: Hard words and great confidence may*

puzle

puzle many, and ſome eaſie natures may perhaps ſuſpect them to be in the right, becauſe they pretend they cannot be in the wrong. Many think it the eaſier task to chooſe their Guide than their Religion, and they'l rather follow where others lead them, than ſeek the way themſelves. Some leave our Communion becauſe we damn not all in the Romiſh, thus making our Charity a pretence for their Errors; if we in pity of their ignorance, or conſideration of their general Repentance, hope that God may have mercy on any in that Communion, this preſently muſt be conſtrued for a Confeſſion that the Romiſh Religion is the ſafe way to Salvation, and our kindneſs to ſome well-meaning Perſons muſt be uſed as an Argument to perſwade unſtable People, that we acknowledge theirs to be the Truth. When I conſidered theſe and ſuch like poor Arguments by which many are deluded, I could not think that I could do more ſervice to the Church, than by preſſing the unreaſonableneſs

of

of the Romaniſts requiring us to return to the Communion of the Romiſh Church. He that thinks that he is bound to leave the Communion of the Engliſh, for the Communion of the Romiſh Church, muſt conſider, whether is the likelier way to Salvation: If a man may be ſaved that doth continue in the Engliſh Church, and there is no danger by his continuance in it; then 'tis no neceſſity for him to deſert the Communion of it: and if he cannot be ſaved in that Communion, but muſt return to the Romiſh Church, then he muſt conſider what is the neceſſary condition of Communion with it, and that is the Profeſſion of thoſe Doctrines which it requires to be believed as neceſſary to Salvation, and the publick allowance of the general practices in it: and if there be not ſufficient reaſon to oblige us to profeſs that Doctrine it requires to be believed, and to allow its practices, then there is ſufficient reaſon to excuſe our diſſent from the Romiſh Communion. Theſe grounds I have in the former part

conſidered,

conſidered, and ſhew'd that there are ſome Articles which by the Creed of Pius *the fourth we are bound to profeſs, which are ſo far from being* de fide, *that they are uncertain and doubtful, and the grounds on which they build theſe Doctrines wholly perplexed and obſcure, and that many of them ſince the Council of* Trent *have been forced to acknowledg it. I have inſtanced in four Articles* (i. e.) *in that Article, that the Holy Catholick Apoſtolick Roman Church, is the Mother and Miſtris of all Churches: In the Article of Tranſubſtantiation, of Invocation of Saints, and of Indulgences: I have alſo inſtanced in the Profeſſion which they make, that they do moſt firmly admit and embrace the Apoſtolical and Eccleſiaſtical Traditions, and other obſervations of that Church: And it's declared by the Council, that the Church hath uſed in the Sacrifice of the Maſs Ceremonies, as Myſtical Bleſſings, Lights, Incenſe, Garments, &c. from Apoſtolical Diſcipline and Tradition: And*

have

have ſhewed that for many of theſe things, at beſt, there is no certain ground that they were delivered to the Church by the Apoſtles; and for others of thoſe pretended Traditions they are vain, fooliſh, and cannot be excuſed from all Superſtition. I have inſtanced alſo in many falſities and untruths in their Prayers, in many impieties in their publick Offices, aſcribing too much to the Creature, and derogating from the honour of Chriſt. Laſtly, I have ſhew'd that many Prayers which have been anciently uſed in their Church are irreconcileable with the grounds of ſome preſent Doctrines, and therefore theſe Doctrines appear plain Innovations. I ſhall now purſue ſome other Arguments from the uncertainty of ſome Doctrines, which they require under pain of damnation to be believed and profeſſed: from the oppoſition betwixt their Prayers yet retained, and their publick Doctrines and Practices: the inconſiſtency of their Doctrine with the welfare,

and

and ſecurity of civil Societies: And I ſhall alſo add theſe conſiderations, That the Proteſtants in many Doctrines now controverted betwixt them and the Romiſh Church, take that way which according to the Romiſh grounds is the ſafeſt. But that thoſe Doctrines and Practices in which the Romaniſts differ from us, plainly tend to the advancement of their Clergy and the ſubjection of the Laity to the power of their Prieſts: and if Men will impartially weigh them, appear not to be the fruits of true Piety, but of Covetouſneſs and Ambition. And now though ſome notwithſtanding the cogency of our Arguments change their Religion, yet ſtill our cauſe is the ſame. Though ſome Straglers be cut off, yet the day is not loſt. If any do deſert the Communion of the Church of England, *I pity their weakneſs, and pray that they may be convinced of their Error, and brought back to the acknowledgement of the Truth; and ſhall indeavor to ſatisfie*

others,

others, as I am ſatisfied my ſelf, That it is unreaſonable for the Romaniſts to require us to joyn in the Communion of the preſent Romiſh Church.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

I Draw my firſt conſideration from the inconſiſtency of many of their doctrines with the ſecurity of civil ſocieties. When I conſider ſome doctrines defined, and others publickly maintained by the greateſt part in that Church, I cannot ſee that any civil ſocieties can be ſecure; at leaſt the peace of any Nation and ſecurity of the Civil Government, (where ſuch doctrines are avowed,) muſt needs ſtand on a ſandy foundation. And this even thoſe Princes who adhere to the Romiſh Church, are in their differences with the Popes ſenſible of; and therefore they give the Clergy in thoſe caſes leave to

talk, but they do what they ſee is neceſſary for the ſupport of their Civil State: and decry theſe opinions as abſolutely inconſiſtent with the ſecurity and ſafety of their Kingdoms.

1. I inſtance in the Doctrine of the Popes power. If we ſuppoſe in a Nation any abſolute uncontroulable power diſtinct from the civil, 'tis impoſſible to preſerve that Nation without conſtant jars, and quarrels: there muſt needs be perpetual claſhings of juriſdictions, and incroachments one upon another: either power will determine what belongs to its cognizance, and perhaps the one may challenge what really belongs to the other; and while either juriſdiction vindicates its own rights, the people are diſtracted in their obedience and the peace of the Nation ſhaken. 'Tis eaſily obſervable that the Papal power hath pretended many things to belong to Eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction which really belong to the Civil. I ſee no reaſon why Uſury ſhould be more a ſpiritual crime than Robbery, or why Fornication and Adultery are more of Eccleſiaſtical cogni-

zance,

zance, than Aſſaults and Batteries: and therefore though theſe cauſes as many other may be determined by the Clergy, as well as Laity, where the Prince pleaſes, as he may appoint ſeveral Courts for the audience of ſeveral Cauſes: but now the Papal power hath pretended many things to be of Eccleſiaſtical cognizance, which properly in themſelves are not, and hath publiſhed ſeveral Laws about them, and excommunicates thoſe who ſhall intermeddle with any of theſe cauſes, *præter juris Canonici diſpoſitionem*, beſides the appointment of the Cannon Law; ſo that either the Civil Power muſt exclude it ſelf from whatever the Popes challenge to belong to Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, or if the Civil Magiſtrate ſtand upon his right, there muſt needs follow conſtant jars and confuſions. If the Pope may require the people for the redemption of their ſouls to viſit the Holy Land, or perſonally to fight againſt the enemies of the Chriſtian Faith, and if the King by the tenure of their Lands may at the ſame time oblige them perſonally to aſſiſt in

his wars, here must needs follow distractions, and disturbances: if they go to the Holy Land they are liable to the forfeiture of their estates at home; if they tarry to assist their Prince, liable to excommunication for not obeying the Pope: either they must please two Masters, which if their commands be contrary, will prove impossible; or if they do not obey, then they are exposed to indure the punishment, which the offended power can inflict. If the Pope require a tax for his Wars, as *Gregory* the ninth for his against *Frederick*, and he had so great an one from the Clergy, that they were forced to sell or pawn the very Vessels of the Altar to pay it, as we are informed by *Matthew Paris*: * And if the King command one at the same time, under what poverty and misery must a Nation groan? Or suppose the Pope require from the Clergy resident a third part of their goods, and from the Nonresidents a moity, and the King forbid the payment, which case did happen as *Matthew Paris* * relates, how miserably may the people be distracted

* *Hist. major anno* 1229.

* *Hist. major anno* 1246.

ſtracted by theſe contrary commands? And yet this is but the natural ſequel of two equal diſtinct powers. Our Hiſtorians tell us enough of the Popes actions under weak Princes, when their troubles at home made them unable to reſiſt the Popes incroachments: I'le inſtance in two paſſages one out of *Matthew Paris*, when *Otho* the Legate departed home, there was not left ſo much mony in *England*, excepting the Veſſels of the Altars and the Ornaments of Churches, as he had extorted from this Kingdom: another out of *Thomas Walſingham* * that when Cardinal *Pilous* left *England*, he carried ſo great a ſum of mony with him, as was never at any time paid for Tax or Tallage. If then the Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Powers may according to their pleaſures impoſe Taxes, and that perhaps to maintain their power one againſt another; I do not ſee that any Subject can expect to enjoy his eſtate, or any Nation to live in quiet. Did we ſuppoſe the Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Power thus equal and independent of each other in a Nation,

Hiſt. major anno 1241.

Hiſt. Ric. 2. anno 1381.

I cannot ſee but this *imperium in imperio* muſt need expoſe the quiet and ſafety of a Nation to great hazards. But ſhould we look nearer into the power, which the Pope challenges, and to that which the moſt Romaniſts do give him; we ſhould then ſee the inſecurity of any Civil government, no King could ſit faſt on his Throne, nor any people ſecure in their Poſſeſſions.

1. Many Popes have challenged a ſupream direct power in temporal affairs, that they have *jus utriuſque Gladii*: ſo *Boniface* the eighth publiſhed in the extravagant, that they were placed by Chriſt Lords over all Nations to pluck up and deſtroy, to plant and to build: ſo ſaid *Pius* the fifth in his Bull againſt Queen *Elizabeth*, that the Pope hath power of giving and taking away Kingdoms through the whole Chriſtian World: that whatever any Power or Majeſty any Kings or Emperors have, depend on the Roman Church: So *Clement* the fifth decreed in the Council of *Vienna*; and when *Clement* the ſixth had in a publick Conſiſtory made *Lewis*

Clem. paſtoralis de Re judic.

of

of *Spain* Prince of the Fortunate Islands, he took this for his Text, *faciam principem super gentem magnam*, as *Thomas Walsingham* reports. This the Popes have challenged, and by vertue of this power they have disposed Kingdoms and altered Governments. *Alexander* the sixth gave the *Indies* to the *Spaniard*, the Bull is extant, * wherein (he says) that by the authority of God which was given to the Popes in the person of *Peter*, and which they hold as Vicars of Christ, we give to you all the Isles and firm Land found and to be found, with their Dominions, Cities, Castles, Villages, Rights and Jurisdictions: and 'tis inserted into the Canon Law that the Apostolick See translated the Roman Empire from the *Greeks* to the *Germans*; * and *Bellarmine* pretends that when *Leo* the third did thus, he did it as Pope, and as he had Apostolical power, by which in case it be profitable or necessary for Christianity, he may dispose of the Kingdoms and Empires of Christians. * Now if the Pope doth claim this power as the *capo di christianità*, as the head

Hist Edw. 3. anno 1344.

* *Lopes de Gomara Hist. Indic. l. 1. c. 19.*

* *Cap. Venerab. de elect.*

* *Bellar. risposta al 3. prop. di Gio Martil.*

of the Christians, and may thus as he pleases translate Governments, dispose Kingdoms, and change the Laws, I would fain see what Kings and Princes can be secure? Kings must no longer plead that they hold their Crowns by God and their right, but meerly as the Popes deputies; and he may call in the patent of their Office when he pleases: no Prince can be secure if an angry Pope take a pique at him; nor keep his Crown on his head if the Pope have a mind to throw it off. Princes must no longer talk of Election or succession, for they have no title but the Popes grant or his permission, and he may by this authority unking them if he think them unfit to govern, as Pope *Zachary* did *Chilperick*, and to prevent disturbance among Christians *ne perturbaretur Christianitatis ordo*, by his Apostolick authority commanded that *Pipin* should be made King. Should a *Boniface* the eighth, a *Julius* the second, or *Paul* the third sit in the Chair, let Princes look to themselves, if the Pope challenge this power, they will never want pretences to put it

Chron. Regin. lib. 2. anno 749.

in

in uſe: and what ſecurity can then their neighbours have when by the fulneſs of Apoſtolick power they can ſo ſoon put down one family and raiſe another? what aſſurance of obedience can they have from their popiſh ſubjects when the Pope as the Vicar of Chriſt, to whom all power is given in Heaven and Earth, challenges this power to place and diſplace? either they muſt diſown obedience to the Pope in what he challenges as the Vicar of Chriſt, and Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, or they muſt be good ſubjects no longer than he pleaſes: either they muſt ſay the Popes have erred in this power they have challenged, and that they are not bound to obey them in that thing which they pretend to command as Vicars of Chriſt, or that no King can be ſecured of his ſubjects obedience longer than this Lord paramount permits. Thus according to that power which the Popes have challenged, there can be no ſecurity for the Civil Government.

2. Let us ſee what power the moſt Romaniſts do give to the Pope. I will not

ſpeak

ſpeak of the Canoniſts who uſually flatter the Popes, and call him the Lord of the whole world; and give him as much power as the moſt ambitious Popes can challenge: I ſhall only mention what the Divines of the Romiſh party generally give him, and they do tell us that all kind of power which may be neceſſary for his univerſal paſtorſhip is included in theſe words, Feed my ſheep: that Kings are ſpiritually ſubject to *Peter* and his ſucceſſors; that this ſpiritual power is to direct all the acts of ſubjects by which they may either loſe or gain eternal life: that one of theſe acts in a Chriſtian Prince is the uſe of his governing power. And therefore ſay they, it pertains to the ſpiritual power to direct him in the uſe of that governing power, and if he fails in the management of that power, and does not manage it according as it ſhall ſeem good to the ſpiritual power, then to reſtrain him in the exerciſe of it and prevent any damage which may ariſe thereby: thus he hath a power *indirectè & in ordine ad ſpiritualia* over the temporal. So

that

that by this power which they generally give the Pope, it follows that if the Magiſtrate make any Laws which (as he thinks) do favour ſin, or are any way prejudicial to the intereſt of the Church; if they hinder good or occaſion evi, theſe he may correct, either by publiſhing contrary Laws, or commanding the ſecular Princes to revoke them: and this (ſays *Suarez*) * is the common opinion of Divines, approved by the cuſtom of the Church, and it is not lawful for any Catholick to doubt of the Popes power. So again, if the Civil Magiſtrate make any war which the Pope thinks unlawful, he may forbid it, becauſe by ſuch a war he abuſes his power: ſo if the Pope ſees a war neceſſary for the good of Religion, he may command the Magiſtrate to make war: And becauſe a directive power is nothing (as they think) without a coactive, therefore if any Prince refuſe to obey this command, the Pope may puniſh him. * Now though they do not call this a direct power, yet it is in effect, for he may meddle with temporal affairs with moſt

* *Adv. ſect. Angl. l. 3. c. 22.*

* *Suarez 161. c. 23. n. 2.*

most full authority says *Bellarmin*, * out of the *opusculum de regimne principum*, *l.* 3. *c.* 11. *&* *c.* 13. he may depose Kings and make new ones, and this says *Victoria* * none that is truly a Christian will deny : and elsewhere he calls it a most ample power, by which he can make and unmake Kings, divide Kingdoms, *&c.* This is then the power which the most *Romanists* ascribe to the Pope, but even according to this there can be no security for any Civil Government longer than he pleases, nor can any Princes be assured of their estates, longer than they submit to the Popes will: whatever Laws they make for the welfare of their estates must pass the Popes approbation: if they raise any Tax, they must ask the Popes leave; if they condemn any subject for Treason, the sentence must be reviewed by the Pope: they must list no Souldiers, raise no Forces, make no War without the Popes license: For if the Pope have this most ample power to direct the actions of Kings, and restrain them from any act which he judges to be the occasion of

* *Risposta al 3. propos.*

* *Relect. de Indis. prop. 3.*

* *Relect. 1. de pot. Eccl. n. 12.*

of ſin, or the hindrance of ſpiritual good: then no King ſhall be Judge when or what tax he ſhall lay, for the Pope may call that an oppreſſion of the people: then no King ſhall be judge when or what forces he ſhall raiſe or where he ſhall make war, for the Pope may ſay, that the war is unneceſſary, and a cauſeleſs ſpilling of Chriſtian blood: then no King can puniſh a Traytor without the Popes liking, for 'tis the Popes office to hinder any publick ſins, and the moral occaſions of them, ſaith *Suarex*. * If therefore the Pope ſaith, that there hath been partiality and injuſtice; that the cauſe hath not been fully heard, or the proofs not evident enough, or the ſentence too much haſtned, he may ſtop the proceedings. Grant once this power in the Pope, which yet as *Bellarmine* ſaith * all but Hereticks will grant, and which it is not lawful for any Catholick to doubt of, ſaith *Suarez* *; and then let me ſee where any temporal government is any thing elſe, but a meer ſhadow of power? or any Prince longer ſecure in his government than he is wholly at

* *Adv ſect. Angl. l. 3. c. 22. n. 14.*

* *Riſpoſta al 3. prop.*

* *161. n. 10.*

at the Popes beck? So that in effect this makes the Pope the only Monarch, and all Princes no better than his Legates. I will inſtance in ſome things, wherein may appear the inconſiſtency of this pretended power, with the ſecurity and welfare of Civil Societies. 1. I inſtance in the invalidating and declaring null and void, Laws which have been made for the welfare of the Civil State. If the Pope have really a power to make null and void thoſe Laws which the State ſhall judge neceſſary for its own ſecurity and ſafety; then the power which is given him is inconſiſtent with the welfare of a Civil Society. Suppoſe a Statute of Mortmain, that no gifts of Lands *in perpetuum* to any Eccleſiaſtical uſe, ſhall be valid without the Magiſtrates conſent. This Law hath been made generally in all Chriſtian ſtates. And 'tis plain that in many Kingdoms there hath been a neceſſity of reſtraining the immoderate gifts to Eccleſiaſtical perſons and uſes: for Eccleſiaſtcal perſons having many priviledges and exemptions by the bounty of Princes, and the Lands coming

ing

ing into the Clergies hands, the burden would wholly lie upon the Laity, and they being oppreſſed with conſtant charges and impoveriſhed, the neceſſities of the Nation could not be ſupplied, nor the dignity of it upheld. And yet by virtue of this power the Popes have declared this Law null and void, as contrary to Eccleſiaſtical liberty. 'Tis plain that if the Clergy might purchaſe what they pleaſe, and enjoy whatever comes to them either by gifts or legacies, and have no power to alienate what once they have got; that by degrees they may get all into their hands. And as the Author of the review of the Council of *Trent* * ſaith, they will have all the Laity only for Renters and Farmers of their goods. And therefore it hath been neceſſary to forbid the paſſing of any eſtates to the Clergy without the Magiſtrates conſent; and yet the Popes by virtue of this power, which is commonly given them, declare theſe Laws which are meerly for ſelf-preſervation, void and null. Suppoſe a Law, as that which the *Venetians* made, that none ſhould

* *L. 7. c. 9.*

ſhould build a Church or Monaſtery within the City of *Venice*, or the Juriſdiction of it without the conſent of the Senate, for the ſoyl on which they were built was formerly under the juriſdiction of the State, and it was not reaſonable that the State ſhould loſe its power and right over the ſoyl without its own conſent, and ſhould this be allowed, then every private perſon might place them where he pleaſed, and in proceſs of time the multitude of Churches and Monaſteries might take up the moſt part of the City, there might be little ſpace left for the Citizens to inhabit, and the Fortifications of the City might be weakned by the incommodious ſite of thoſe religious places. Many ſubſtantial reaſons the State of *Venice* gave, which may be found in the *Aviſo di Antonio Quirino*, and the *Conſiderationi del Padre Paolo*. And yet *Paul* the fifth condemns this Law for unjuſt, and contrary to Eccleſiaſtical liberty: and this was one reaſon of the Interdict of *Venice*. Suppoſe a Law that the money of the Nation ſhould not be carried beyond

Sea

Sea, leſt the Nation be exhauſted, and foreign enemies enriched with the wealth of the Land; for ſo it might eaſily be, when the rents of the Clerks Aliens in *England* in the time of *Innocent* the fourth, was 70000. marks, and the Ordinary revenue of the King was not computed to the third part: as it was found to be by the reckoning of *Robert* Biſhop of *Lincoln*, ſaith *Matthew Paris* *: and at one time there were no leſs than 300. *Italians* beneficed here. And the wealth that was exported to the Court of *Rome*, was frequently lent by the Pope to the Enemies of the State, as it oft happened in our wars with *France*: yet ſtill the Popes have pretended a power to condemn this Law as null and void, and contrary to the power of the Pope, and the dignity of the Roman See. So if the King ſhould forbid any Souldiers going out of the Land, leſt it be left naked and expoſed to a foreign enemy; and on the other hand, if the Pope may require them to aſſiſt in his Wars for the maintenance of St. *Peters* Patrimony, and the defence

* *Hiſt. major anno* 1252.

of the Church; if now the Pope have this power to null these Laws which he judges prejudicial to his interest, and by virtue of any Superior power (whether we call it a direct, or indirect power) can call these Souldiers away, it will follow that no Civil Society or Government hath any means to preserve it self: there is no proper means left to prevent disorders and confusion, ruine and destruction in a Kingdom: nor can any King secure himself or his people longer than the Pope pleases. Thus even that power which the Romanists generally ascribe to the Pope, is no way consistent with the security of the Civil State. For whatever Laws are made by any Civil State, for the necessary defence and support of it self, may by this power be declared null; whatever course in prudence they take for the preserving the wealth and strength of the Nation, may be condemned as prejudicial to the Ecclesiastical liberty. Whatever forces they raise for their necessary defence, may be call'd away, and the Nation exposed to foreign enemies. Grant this

power

power in the Pope, and I would fain ſee which way Princes can ſecure their Crowns from the Popes uſurpations. There is no way but this, that Princes are grown wiſer than to be talk'd out of their power, and if the Pope have the *verbalis*, yet Princes have the *realis poteſtas*, as the French Ambaſſador anſwered *Boniface* the eighth: * but were there a *Julius* the ſecond in the Chair that knew how to manage St. *Pauls* Sword as well as St. *Peters* Keys, and would his temporal with ſpiritual arms as he uſed to do; Kings and Princes would ſoon ſee the fruits of this doctrine. That power which the Popes challenge, and moſt Romaniſts give him, is inconſiſtent with the ſecurity of the Civil State; and where Popes can do as much as they pretend they may do, Kings muſt be meer Vaſſals to the Pope, and at moſt but half Kings.

* *Hypodigma Neuſtriæ anno* 1301.

2. I inſtance in the doctrine of the Popes power in abſolving men from their promiſſory Oaths. And if the Pope is allowed by their doctrine to diſpenſe with promiſes, and abſolve men from the

Oaths they have taken, I know not how any can be ſecured of the faith and honeſty of thoſe who own this power. For if they have promiſed and ſworn never ſo fully, yet there are many caſes in which the Pope can abſolve them; and where are we then? And if they are not abſolved, it is becauſe they do not make uſe of that liberty which many times is, and always may be granted to them. If they may be abſolved by any, or releaſed from the obligation of that Oath by any, except for whoſe benefit they have ſworn; then it is to no purpoſe to oblige them by an Oath. It is in vain for Kings to ſwear to preſerve the liberty or rights of the people, or for the people to ſwear Allegiance to the Prince, or for Princes mutually to ſwear to obſerve any leagues and agreements they make one with another; for they can never be tyed ſo faſt, but the Pope can looſe them. If they ſhould ſwear that they would ſeek no diſpenſation nor abſolution, yet you may be diſpenſed with for that perjury, and abſolved from that Oath, as well as from

the

the other. They tell us, 1. That the Pope may dispense with Oaths if there be just cause: so says * *Angelus à Clanasio.* And that the Pope may upon a cause *ex toto liberare* free a man wholly from his Oath, even as God himself; for it is very likely that God (where there is cause) hath given his power among men to his Vicar, otherwise he had not been a good Master of a Family, if he had left his Flock without a Shepheard, who where there was cause might befriend them. This is the Doctrine of *Summa Rosellæ**: and that he may relax an Oath, both by taking away the bond of the Oath, remitting that obligation *vice Dei*; and by forbidding him to perform the Oath, so says *Filliucius* *. 2. If the case seem doubtful whether there be a just cause for dispensing with the Oath or no; that it must be left to the determination of the Pope, and that if the Pope doth judge there is a sufficient cause, and doth dispense with the Oath, that the person is safe in Conscience; and after the Pope hath dispensed with him, he is not bound to perform his Oath:

* *Sum. Angel. Juram.* 6.

* *Sum. Rosellæ. Juram.* 1. n. 4. 5.

* *Cas. Consc. li.* 25. *c.* 9. *n.* 281.

and further, if the Pope did absolve any man from an Oath without cause, the absolution holds; for says *Summa Rosellæ**, he is above the positive Law, and may dispense with the Divine Law; so that he do not dispense with the Gospel, or the Articles of Faith. 3. They tell us that if a man hath taken any Oath, which is the hindrance of a greater good, the Pope may dispense with it: And though the thing be lawful and honest in it self, and in his power to do it; yet if it hinder him from doing a greater good, the Pope may take off the obligation, by declaring that in this case the Oath doth not bind him, because of the good which would be hindred, or the evil which would follow if such an Oath were kept. 4. They tell us, that the Pope may in some cases absolve the Subjects of Princes from their Allegiance: if a Prince be excommunicate, that the bond of the Oath is so long suspended till he be reconciled to the Church; but if a Prince be deprived of his Dominion for heresie, or any other crime, then that the Oath is made void

* *Verb. Juram.* 1. *n.* 4.

void and null, ſo ſaith *Suarez* *; and that there is ſuch a power of abſolving Subjects from their Allegiance, he pleads from the ancient cuſtom of the Church, and practice of Popes: and indeed the practice hath been too evident, eſpecially if Princes any way diſpleaſed the Pope. I'le inſtance in the caſe of Inveſtitures, which was the quarrel with the *German* Emperor *Henry* the fourth, upon which account the Pope depoſed him, and abſolved his Subjects from all Oaths of Allegiance to him: though the Emperour might plead a preſcription of 200 years and more, under 60 Popes, for giving Biſhopricks and Abbies by the Ring and Staff *. And though he might plead the very grant of the Popes themſelves, as of *Adrian* the firſt in the Roman Synod, to *Charles* the great; that Archbiſhops and Biſhops ſhould receive their inveſtitures from him, and unleſs they were named and inveſted by him they ſhould not be conſecrated. * And though really there was no ſin in the Emperors nomination to Biſhopricks and Abbies, (for what ſin is it for the Em-

* *Adv. ſect. Ang. l. 6. n. 2.*

* *Mat. Paris hiſt. major anno* 1112. *Sigebert anno* 1111.

* *Mat. Weſtmon. hiſt. anno* 773.

peror to give the Eccleſiaſtical perſons poſſeſſion of their temporalties, and to require an Oath of fealty or homage to them; for thoſe temporalties which had been the gift of former Emperors; and to nominate perſons to thoſe dignities, any more than for a Lay Patron, upon the account of indowing the Church, to preſent to an Eccleſiaſtical Benefice?) and yet becauſe the Emperor did not appear at the Popes ſummons to ſatisfie his demands, he was excommunicate, and his Subjects abſolved from their allegiance to him. This is their Doctrine, this their Practice. But now I ſee not how this power to abſolve men from their Oaths which are lawful and honeſt in themſelves, meerly on pretence of ſcandal, or the hindrance of a publick good, can be conſiſtent with the ſecurity of a Civil Society? Grant the Pope this power which he hath frequenly practiſed, and the Romiſh party generally acknowledge to be in him, and no Romaniſt can be a good Subject longer than he pleaſes, nor be bound by the ſolemneſt Oaths which Princes have framed

framed for their own ſecurity, longer than he allows it: If the Pope invade any neighbour Princes dominions, and that Prince to divert the war fall on the Popes territories, then preſently excommunicate him, and abſolve his Souldiers from all Oaths to him. Thus did *Urban* the ſecond to the Souldiers of Count *Hugo*, for he tells them that ſtood upon their Oaths to him, that they muſt obey God and not man, and that they were not bound to pay obedience which they had ſworn to any Chriſtian Prince, if he oppoſed God and his Saints. * If any Prince oppoſe the exactions of the Roman Court, the next is, excommunicate him and free his Subjects from all bonds of Oaths. If any Prince refuſe to ſuffer his Subjects to go out of his Land, leſt they diſcover the ſecrets of his Kingdom, then excommunicate him, and releaſe them from the Oaths they have taken of Loyalty and Allegiance. Yea if theſe men ſwear that they will not go out without the Princes leave, yet the Pope abſolves them; ſo that Oaths can bind no longer than the Pope judges them

* *urban. 2. epiſtole ad ep. Vapicens. 1. cauſ. 15. q 6. can. Jurator.*

them fit to be obſerved, and where the Oath they have taken croſſes his deſign, no queſtion but the Pope will judge it unfit to be obſerved. If they ſwear to bear true faith to the King and his Succeſſors, all this is to be underſtood, unleſs the Pope abſolves them, for then the obligation ceaſes; and the Pope may abſolve them, if he thinks this Oath to be an hindrance of a greater good: and now if the Prince to whom they ſwear allegiance be an Heretick, and draw men from their Catholick Faith, then the obedience to him may be in the Popes judgement an hindrance of a greater good. Weigh theſe things ſeriouſly, and then tell me what ſecurity any Prince can really have of the fidelity and loyalty of theſe kind of Subjects? For either they muſt ſay, that they are ſtill bound, and judge themſelves bound by their Oaths, notwithſtanding the Popes abſolving them, or diſpenſing with them; which is (as the Romaniſts generally tell us) to diſown the Popes Supream power, and to deny the authority of binding and looſing,

which

which was given to St. *Peter*, and his Succeſſors: or elſe they muſt confeſs that they are bound to obey, till he abſolve them, and after he hath abſolved them, then they are free: and then what ſecurity hath any King of their Allegiance? I do not ſay but ſome Roman Catholicks are and have been Loyal to Heretical Princes, as they call them; my deſign is not to render their Loyalty ſuſpicious, or exaſperate our Superiors againſt all that profeſs themſelves of the Romiſh Communion; no queſtion but ſome do not know theſe doctrines of their party, and ſome that know them, yet out of a natural honeſty abhor ſuch dangerous opinions; but if they do own this doctrine, which to deny faith *Suarez* * is againſt the cuſtom of the Church, the practice of General Councils, and the appobation of the Canon Law in *Cap.* 2. *de Re Judicatâ* in 6. and againſt the conſent of the Catholick Doctors: how then can any Prince be ſecured of their Allegiance longer than the Pope allows it? They may be good Subjects for the preſent, but what ſecurity that they will con-

* *Def. fid. Cath. adv. ſect. Angl. l. 6. c. 2. n. 7*

continue ſo? They may think themſelves bound by their Oaths at preſent, but ſhould the Pope on any pique or pretence, quarrel with the King, and abſolve them from theſe Oaths, what ſecurity that then they will keep theſe Oaths, and continue good Subjects? I deſign not by this Diſcourſe to urge the execution of any penal Laws, I wiſh the Doctrine and practices of the Romaniſts had never given occaſion for the making of them: but if the wiſdom of the State ſhall think fit to ſuſpend the execution of any Law, or moderate the penalty, I wiſh thoſe who receive any benefit by that Indulgence, may endeavour to deſerve the Favour: yet if the Doctrines generally held by any party, are inconſiſtent with the ſecurity of the Kingdom, none can reaſonably ſay, that we deſign any uncharitableneſs to their perſons, in diſcovering their errors. I cannot be ſaid to perſwade the execution of a Rebel, becauſe I endeavour to convince him of his ſin. If the generality of their Writers maintain ſuch Doctrines, I cannot be blamed for diſcover-

ing

ing the inconſiſtency of them with the ſecurity of the Civil State, though the State indeavours to preſerve it ſelf from thoſe who are tainted with ſuch principles and opinions. 'Tis well known that the Romiſh party generally refuſe the Oath of Allegiance, and though ſome of them at the firſt framing of the Oath ſeemed willing to give the State ſome aſſurance of their Loyalty by taking of it; but when the Pope heard of it, he ſends his Breve dated *Septemb.* 22. 1606. and tells them, they cannot take that Oath without the great injury of the Divine Honour, nor perform it with a ſafe Conſcience, and that they ſhould ſuffer all kind of torments, even death it ſelf, rather than offend Gods majeſty by ſuch an Oath: and when this Breve was ſuſpected to be forged, or that the Pope did grant it upon miſinformation, and at the ſolicitation of others: He ſends therefore another Breve dated *Aug.* 23. 1607. in which he expoſtulates with them for queſtioning that Breve; and declares that thoſe Letters were written not only *motu proprio & ex certâ*

tâ ſcientiâ of his own motion and certain knowledge, but after long deliberation, and therefore requires them to obey that Breve. And afterwards in a third Breve commands the Archpriest to puniſh by the deprivation of faculties, all ſuch Engliſh Prieſts of the Seminaries, as being ſubject to his juriſdiction had already taken the Oath, or had taught it to be lawful to take it. And after this ſeveral of the Romiſh party, as *Bellarmine*, *Becanus*, *Leſſius*, *Suarez*, &c. beſides many of our own Country did write particular Tracts againſt taking this Oath; and when ſome few did appear in defence of the lawfulneſs of it, as *Widdrington* particularly in his *diſputatio Theologica de Juramento Fidelitatis*, dedicated to *Paul* the fifth, had defended the Lawfulneſs of it, the Congregation of Cardinals deputed for the examination of Books doth utterly condemn and prohibit this Book, and another writ by him called the Apology of *Cardinal Bellarmine* for the right of Princes, *&c.* and declares, that except the Author who profeſſes himſelf a Catholick,

tholick, do clear himſelf forthwith; that he ſhall be throughly puniſhed with cenſures, and other Eccleſiaſtical penalties: Thus zealous have the chiefeſt in the Romiſh Church been againſt the taking of this Oath. They pretended that it was more than an Oath of meer Allegiance; that it was covertly a renouncing of the Popes power, for they ſwear in this Oath that the Pope hath no power to depoſe Princes, and to abſolve Subjects from their Oaths to them, or they tell us that if it were meerly an Oath of Civil Obedience, it was lawful, that the King might require ſuch an Oath of his Subjects; that they may ſafely, yea and ought to take it, when it is required in a convenient way, and alſo to keep it; and if King *James* had required no more, that the Pope would not have forbid the Catholicks to take it, ſo ſaith *Suarez**.

* *Def. fid. Cath. l. 6. de Jur. del. in proœmio & c. 1.*

But I ask, is there any Oath of Civil obedience which can bind them if the Pope abſolve them? Or is there any Oath which he cannot make null and void if he account it a hindrance of publick

publick good? If they do say this, (as certainly they do say it) then still the King can no way be assured of their Allegiance: and there is no Oath which Princes can frame whereby they may be assured of their Subjects honesty and faith. If they scruple this Oath, because they must swear that the Pope hath no power by himself, nor any other authority of the Church, or Romish See, to depose the King or dispose of his Dominion, or to free his Subjects from their Allegiance to him, and that notwithstanding all such sentence of excommunication or deprivation made or to be made against the said King and his Heirs, they will bear true Faith and Allegiance to them: If they scruple the Oath upon this reason, then what security can they give the King that they will bear true Faith and Allegiance? If they will not renounce such pretended powers as the Pope challenges, and declare that they cannot be freed from the obligation of the Oath which they have taken, then they do implicitly acknowledge, that they own such a power in the

Pope

Pope to depoſe the King, and abſolve his Subjects, and if the Pope ſhall do this, they will no longer obſerve the Oaths to him, and where is then the ſecurity of their obedience? The Original ground of the Romiſh parties oppoſing King *James* was *Clement* the eighth his Bull, whereby any perſon was declared incapable of the ſucceſſion to this Crown, that was not a Roman Catholick, and they were forbid to admit any one to be King, that was not of that Religion; on this ground did the Conſpirators in the Powder-plot lay their deſign, that is, to deſtroy the Hereticks, and to plant the Romiſh Catholick Religion; and if the King now to ſecure himſelf and his Government againſt the Romiſh party (who on theſe pretences contrived his ruine,) did require them to take this Oath, either they muſt teſtifie that they believed that they were not abſolved from their obedience, nor could on any pretence of excommunication or deprivation, take arms againſt him, or elſe the King could not be ſecured that they would any longer be

good Subjects and do their duty, than till they had the Popes warrant to the contrary: And is the case yet alter'd? Or has His Majesty any more security of their obedience than his Predecessors had? King *James* had as unquestionable Right to the Crown as King *Charles* the Second, and if it was any real ground to debar King *James* from the Crown, because he was no Roman Catholick, 'tis as real a ground to dispossess King *Charles* of his Crown because he is none: if they hold the same Doctrine, then still there is no security of their obedience. Either they disown this power, to absolve them from their Allegiance, or no; if they disown it, then why do they not take this Oath? if they do not disown it, then the King has no security of their obedience longer than the Pope pleases, and should another Oath be imposed, where these expressions were left out, and the Pope should absolve them from it, either they judge that they are bound still, which they will not say, or else the King has still no further security of their obedience, than while the Pope pleases: and

so

ſo long as they hold theſe principles, frame what Oath ye will, the King can have none. The queſtion is not, whether any of the Roman Catholicks are good ſubjects, for without queſtion ſome of them are; and it would be ſtrange if they ſhould not be good ſubjects, when they have ſo little pretence to be bad: many of them were exceeding faithful to his late Majeſty in the Engliſh Wars, and as I perſwade my ſelf, not only out of reſpect to their intereſt, but compliance with their duty; but ſuppoſe the Pope ſhould pretend juſt cauſe to Abſolve them from the Allegiance to the King; the queſtion then is, what ſecurity can the King have from the Oaths of his Catholick ſubjects, that they will continue good ſubjects? What ſecurity, when they are Loyal only by the leave of his Enemies? In the War betwixt the King, and ſome diſloyal ſubjects, they might ſide with the King, becauſe there was no pretence of abſolving them from their duty, but in the quarrel betwixt the King and Pope, where the Pope does by this power pretend to abſolve them,

where's then the ſecurity? Thus then, if there be once granted a power in the Pope to abſolve ſubjects from their Oaths to their Princes, when he judges that they hinder a greater good, there really can be no ſecurity for Princes. The ſame I ſay alſo concerning the Oaths of Princes to ſubjects, there can be no ſecurity in the Oaths of Princes, nor can the people ever have aſſurance that they ſhall enjoy the priviledges granted by their Kings, if the Popes can abſolve them. If Kings pretend that their grants were extorted by force, or their conceſſions are judged an hindrance to a publick good, 'tis but gaining the Popes Diſpenſation, and they may ſoon elude their promiſes and Oaths. This advantage ſome princes have taken, who upon any neceſſity of Affairs would eaſily make large Acts of Grace to their people, and bind themſelves by Oath to obſerve their own grants, but would as eaſily break them again; as *Walſingham** obſerves of *Edward* the Firſt, *quoties ſibi tempus commodius arrideret, prætendens ſemper papalem abſolutionem, à præſtito juramento*; that he uſed to break his Oaths when he ſaw a convenient time, & pre-

* Hiſt. Ed. 1. an. 1307.

pretended always the Popes abſolution: But by this means the people can never be ſecured by the Word or Oath of Princes, the confidence betwixt them would be deſtroyed, perpetual jealouſies fomented, and the people can never be ſafe in any conceſſions of their Kings, unleſs they have power in their hands to force the obſervation of them: Grant once this power to the Popes, and Oaths can no longer be accounted an end of ſtrife, they would be but ſingle threads, and if they hold any, 'tis only ſuch tame fellows, who fear an Oath, and think it honeſty to perform what they ſwear, though it be to their hurt: but if men have a mind to be free, 'tis but get a Diſpenſation, and the Court of *Rome* is ſeldom backward in granting a Diſpenſation, *Dummodo affulget aliquid albi vel rubei*, as *Matthew Paris* complained. This is then my ſecond conſideration, from the Doctrine of the Popes power of abſolving men from their Oaths.

3. I inſtance in the Doctrine of depoſing and killing Princes heretical, and excommunicate for Hereſie. For if the Pope

can depoſe Kings and authoriſe men to kill them, I ſee not that any Kings, if the Pope have any quarrel with them, can be ſecure either in their Eſtates or Lives: Suppoſe them accountable for their actions, and liable to be depoſed if they do amiſs, their Government then is meerly precarious, they hold their Eſtate by the will of another, and can no longer be ſecure in the enjoyment of their Crown, than ſuits with the humor and *Caprichio* of their Lord Paramount. Grant the Pope this Power, and no King ſhall be ſafe that hinders the exactions of the Roman Court, that reſtrains the exerciſe of any faculties or grants from the Roman See, howſoever inconvenient in themſelves or derogatory to the Laity: that ſhall ſtop any frivolous Appeals whereby the Subjects are moleſted, and the money exported. If the Pope ſhall judge theſe reſtraints a Violation of the Eccleſiaſtical Liberty, or a diminution of the Popes Priviledges, then Excommunicate and Depoſe him: ſo that Kings muſt either betray their own Rights and the Priviledges of their Crowns, or elſe they

they are liable to be depoſed; and what Kings can think themſelves ſecure when there may ariſe ſo many differences betwixt the Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Juriſdiction? If there may be many occaſions of differences betwixt them, & the Eccleſiaſtical Power may excommunicate and depoſe any Lay-Prince that intermedles with that, which it pretends to be of Eccleſiaſtical cognizance, either Kings muſt yield to what the Popes demand, and then they make themſelves Slaves, or if they may be depoſed for defending (what they judge to be) their Rights, contrary to the Popes excommunication, then they can never be ſecure, nor the people free from troubles: this is the caſe of Princes, that if they be declared Hereticks, they may be depoſed, and who ſhall be judge that they are Hereticks but the Pope? If then the Pope call it Hereſie, (as the Pope did call the defending the right of Inveſtitures, Hereſie) then farewell Kings: grant this power of depoſing Kings on theſe accounts, and they hold their Crowns meerly at the Pope's pleaſure, and can never be ſecure in their

Thrones longer than he permits. And now that this is the commonly received Doctrine of the Romiſh Party, I ſhall clearly prove it. I would indeed have none to think that I charge every one of the Romiſh Communion with this Doctrine; for many who are ſeduced with ſome errors of Popery may yet remain faithful Subjects: there are (I doubt not) ſeveral that profeſs themſelves of that Communion, that deteſt thoſe traitorous poſitions, as the ſcandal of Religion and the bane of Society, that are faithful to their Prince, as well as conſtant in their profeſſion. Notwithſtanding the ſentence of *Pius* the 5th. yet many Roman Catholicks were loyal to Queen *Elizabeth*, ſome offered themſelves with their utmoſt power to oppoſe the Spaniſh Invaſion, though *Sixtus* the 5th. had by his Bull depoſed the Queen, and given the Kingdom to the *Spaniards*; and when *Parſons* talkt openly among the Papiſts about depoſing the Queen, ſome even of themſelves had a purpoſe to complain of him to the Magiſtrates, as our Hiſtorians report. I believe many of them notwithſtanding

ſtanding all the Popes threatnings and curſes to have continued faithful to their natural Princes in the worſt times; but yet I would not have my charity to ſome miſconſtrued for the excuſe of all. Many can profeſs Loyalty, that yet can ſave their opinion by a ſubtle diſtinction; they'l ſay they are bound to obey the King, and that the Pope never forbids them this, but then when the Pope depoſes him, he ceaſes to be King: that's *Bellarmin's* invention. They'l tell us, that they do utterly renounce all Treaſons againſt their Soveraign, but then this muſt be underſtood, that he is no longer their Soveraign if the Pope depoſe him, and if they ſhould then kill him, it was no longer Treaſon. And ſome of thoſe that profeſt to hate all diſloyal opinions, were yet catched in diſloyal practices, as if their large profeſſions were only a Cloak for baſe *Plots* and *Deſigns*. None ſeem'd more zealous againſt the Jeſuits Doctrine of diſloyalty than *Watſon*, who made this ſolemn proteſtation in his Books, That not all the art that either the Devil, or Puritans, or Jeſuits have, ſhould

Quodlib. P. 350.

ſhould bring him within the compaſs of a Treaſonable thought againſt God, his Soveraign, or the Common-wealth of this Land: and to manifeſt his hatred of Treaſon, and his Loyalty to his Prince, conceived the form of an Oath, in effect the ſame with the Oath of Allegiance, that he did from the bottom of his heart plainly and ſincerely without all Equivocation or doubling profeſs and ſwear, That he will never give ear to that bloody Doctrine of depoſing Kings, or diſpoſing Kingdoms for Hereſies ſake; that he will never be perſwaded either by threatnings or promiſes of any (be it the Pope himſelf) to bear Arms againſt her Highneſs Queen *Elizabeth* to the deſtruction of her Royal Perſon and State, and that he will be ready to adventure his Goods and Life againſt him or any that ſhall aſſail or invade her Kingdom under pretence of reſtoring the Catholick Faith: and he proteſts to deteſt that Doctrine, that Princes heretical may be depoſed, & that he abſolutely intends (God aſſiſting him with his grace) to remain conſtant, loyal, ſerviceable and faithful unto the death,

death; * and yet after all this when Pope *Clement* the Eighth his Breves came out forbidding the Roman Catholicks to receive any for King after the death of Queen *Elizabeth* unleſs he was a Catholick, and would take Oath to maintan the Catholick Religion in his Dominions, ſee what a good ſubject this man proves: for in the beginning of King *James* he was executed for Treaſon at *wincheſter*. Some are not yet taught theſe neceſſary points for the advancement of the Catholick Cauſe; perhaps they fear the times will not bear them, or they are fit only to be preached when they may have a deſign that s ripe for Execution: but ſhould the Pope ſend a Breve to forbid obedience to the King, and the Jeſuits preach this Doctrine again to their Novices, I pray God there do not appear too many to p t it in execution. Thoſe that are taught a blind obedience to renounce their own wills, yea and their judgments too, to think whatever their Superior commands, is the will of God, and though they ſhould judge it a ſin, yet if their Superior ſhould tell them

* *Quod lib.* p. 304, 305. 346. 351.

Bakers Chron. Reign of K. *James.*

them it is no ſin, and that they are deceived in judging ſo, that they are bound to believe him. Theſe I cannot think are like to be good ſubjects longer than their Superiors pleaſe. And yet theſe are the Rules of the Jeſuits, this the inſtruction of *Ignatius* their Founder; * but thoſe who follow ſuch inſtructions are eaſily cut out to be Bouteſeus of their Country and Aſſaſſines of Princes. There are ſome who admire that we ſay, the Romiſh principles are inconſiſtent with Civil Governments, * and tell us that this is nothing but the lies and fictions of Proteſtants, for they preach up Obedience and Loyalty more than the Proteſtants; and ſays one, To ſpeak confidently, all Princes are more ſecure, and have a better tie and obligation from Catholicks, than from any Lutherans or Calviniſts whatever; & * therefore he charges the Lutherans in *Germany*, the Calviniſts in *France*, *Holland*, and *Scotland*, with nothing but diſloyal Practices and Doctrines: And (he ſays) that it is the conſent of the more preciſe Proteſtants, that ſubjects by Arms may maintain their Religion,

offend

* *Epiſt. Ignatii de virt. Obedient.*, Sect. 19.

* Apology for the Papiſts.

* Image of both Churches p. 349.

offend as well as defend*. Nor doth this Author ſpare the Clergy of *England*, for though (ſaith he) no trial could be made of their ſpirits; having had no croſſes, nor other combat than with ſin, and *Martin* Prelate; and he were not *compos mentis*, that in ſo great Peace and Proſperity would not Preach againſt diſloyalty and tumults: yet that they were not always ſo peaceable and regular ſince they firſt appeared as Antagoniſts to the Church of *Rome*, that the Proteſtants were neither quiet, nor ſuffered Queen *Mary* to be quiet, and that in the five years of her reign ſhe had more open and violent oppoſition and Rebellion by her Subjects than Queen *Elizabeth* had in 45 years. Theſe things are again revived by *Philanax*, who hath tranſcribed the moſt of that Book, and lookt no further for his quotations againſt Proteſtants of integrity (as he calls them) than that Author: both his quotations in Latine and tranſlations into Engliſh, are for the moſt part there *verbatim*; and ſo punctual is he in this theft, that a piece of falſe Latin can hardly

* Image of both Churches, pag. 352.

hardly ſcape his fingers; for that paſſage which he pretends to be out of *Calvin*, *quibuſcunque hujus Evangelii lux affulget*, &c. *ab omnibus laqueis & juramentis abſolvitur*, was not his own miſtake, but he took it on truſt from that Book pag. 354. Compare *Philanax* his defence of *Mariana* pag. 94. with what the Author of the Image of Both Churches ſaith in that behalf, pag. 360. of the *Tornay* edition; and you will ſee that *Philanax* is little elſe than a new Title to an old Book to make it vendible. What both of them have ſaid is ſufficiently anſwered by that worthy perſon Dr. *Du Moulin*, and the Proteſtants vindicated from thoſe aſperſions; yet ſhould any perſons that call themſelves Proteſtants, have been guilty of ſuch diſloyal and rebellious diſcourſes, I tell them, we juſtifie not the expreſſions of any private perſons, whatever hand they had in the Reformation: we bleſs God for the good they did, but their words are neither the rule for our faith, nor the warrant for our practice. I do not take any private mans words for the

Doctrine

Doctrine of their Church, but the publick Confeſſion, in which the Magiſtrates authority is fully maintained, the bounds of obedience ſtated, and Rebellion plainly condemned. I will not charge any particular Church with the particular fancies, or odd opinions of here and there a paſſionate ſpirit, but with that which is generally preached, publickly maintained without cenſure, and commonly practiſed. As for our own Church in which we are moſt properly concerned, the Doctrine is moſt clearly delivered, that the King is the only Supream Governour, that he is not nor ought to be ſubject to any foreign juriſdiction. The Doctrine of our Homilies forbids all Rebellion, and teaches the neceſſity of obedience: That it is not lawful for Inferiours and Subjects in any caſe to reſiſt and ſtand againſt the Superiour Powers. And where we may not obey Kings, when they command us to do any thing contrary to Gods commands, nevertheleſs in that caſe we may not in any wiſe withſtand violently, or rebel againſt Rulers, or make inſurrection, ſedition, or

tumults

tumults againſt the Anointed of the Lord, or any of his Officers. But we muſt in ſuch caſe patiently ſuffer all wrongs and injuries, referring the Judgement only to Almighty God.* The Doctrine of our Church is, that the ſpeedy overthrow of all Rebels of what number, ſtate or condition ſoever they were, or what colour or cauſe ſoever they pretended, is and ever hath been ſuch, that God thereby ſheweth, that neither the dignity of any perſon, nor the multitude of any people, nor the weight of any cauſe is ſufficient, for the which Subjects may move Rebellion againſt their Princes.* The conſtant Sermons and Writings of the chiefeſt perſons in our Church declare the power of the Magiſtrate, and conformably to the Homilies condemn all inſurrections againſt the King under any pretence whatſoever: ſo that if any who profeſſes himſelf a member of the Church of *England* ſhould be guilty of diſloyalty againſt his lawful Prince, none can aſcribe it to the badneſs of his principles, but of his nature; 'tis not his judgement but his ambition,

* 1 Book of Homil. 2 part of Serm. of obedience.

* 2 Book of Homil. 4 part of the Serm. againſt wi ful Rebellion.

and

and he never pleads that it is his duty, but ſin, nor ever that it is an act meritorious of Heaven, but that it deſerves Hell. But now if we conſult the Decrees of their Councils, the Publick Laws of their Church, what the Popes have challenged and practiſed, what the chiefeſt of their Writers have maintained, and what the generality of their Prieſts teach, we ſhall ſee that their Doctrine is inconſiſtent with the ſecurity of temporal States. I confeſs ſome few Prieſts at home have ſcrupled this Doctrine of the Popes power of depoſing Princes, and have indeavoured to expound the Decrees of Councils in a more favourable ſenſe, but ſtill they were but few, of little authority in their Church; their writings commonly prohibited, as *Roger Widdrington*'s were, and their perſons in danger of cenſures: but the publick Doctrine taught by the head of their Church and generally held by his followers, is inconſiſtent with the ſecurity of the Civil Magiſtrate: and either they muſt diſclaim this Doctrine which is ſo generally taught in the Romiſh Church, or

elſe no Prince can be ſecure from danger.

I find this Doctrine in the Decrees of Councils, in the *Lateran* Council under *Innocent* the third; If any temporal Lord being admoniſht by the Church, ſhall neglect to purge his Land from the filth of Hereſie, let him be excommunicated by the Metropolitan; and if he ſhall refuſe to give ſatisfaction within a year, let it be ſignified to the Pope, that he may then preſently denounce his Vaſſals to be abſolved from their Allegiance, and give their Land to Catholicks, *&c.* This is publiſhed for a Decree of that Council, in which were preſent 1200 Prelates, and is now inſerted into the body of the Canon Law by *Gregory* the ninth,* and the Gloſs there *in verbo Abſolutus* ſaith, that for Hereſie the Pope hath power over the Laity as well as Clergy, and may depoſe them; and the Law there requires the Civil Magiſtrate to take an Oath to root out Hereticks, (which as Cardinal *Zabarell* on this place ſaith, is not now practiſed, yet it is the fault of the Biſhops or the Inquiſitors, that they do not force the Secular

Conc. Later. can. 3.

* *C. excommun. moneantur de Hereticis.*

lar power by Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures to do it): and if they neglect they muſt be depoſed: and *Gregory* the ninth in *C. abſolutos ibi* declares, the Subjects of all perſons who are lapſed to be abſolved: this is the ſubſtance of the Decree of the *Lateran* Council, wherein the Popes power to depoſe Princes is acknowledged, or at leaſt the practice in that caſe of Hereſie of depoſing them is ordained and determined: I know *Widdrington* would fain interpret this Decree of thoſe Temporal Lords who have Superiours, and not of abſolute Princes, and thinks that Kings are not included in a penal Law where they are not expreſly mentioned; but if we look into the Decree, I muſt needs ſay, that they are ſufficiently comprehended in general words, for *Dominus Temporalis* is a general term including Abſolute Princes as well as other Lords, and the Canon ſpeaks of two ſorts of Temporal Lords, ſuch as have Principal Lords above them, and ſuch as have none, and of this ſort are Abſolute Princes who hold of none; and ſince theſe who hold of none as well

as thoſe who hold of others, were declared by the Canon to be ſubject to the ſame penalty, it was needleſs to name Princes in another manner, as I muſt needs acknowldge with his Anſwerer *. If this then be the meaning of the *Lateran* Decree, as the words cannot bear any other ſenſe, and generally is ſo expounded, then Princes had need look to their Crowns, either they muſt expel Hereticks, or be expelled themſelves: if they be merciful and pitiful, if either in policy of ſtate, or commiſeration of their Subjects, or their Conſciences perhaps being convinced of the truth, they will not be as bloody and cruel as St. *Dominick*, that by the Preaching up the War againſt the *Albigenſes* was the cauſe of the death of many thouſands; if they will not deſtroy thoſe whom the Pope pronounces to be Hereticks, then to depoſe them and take away their Eſtate is made lawful: and *Hoſtienſis* on this Title allows the Catholicks on their own authority to ſpoyl Hereticks, and ſaith, that the Church hath given them that wear the Croſs, power and authority

* The Reply of *T. F.* c. 10.

rity againſt them, though he thinks it a ſafer way to ſtay for a particular commiſſion: but if the Canons of Councils do give this power of deſtroying heretical Princes, or ſuch who did not at the Popes command root out thoſe, whom he calls Hereticks, here is little ſecurity for Princes. Again, this very power of depoſing Kings, the Popes for ſeveral ages have claimed, and practiſed; Indeed *Otho Friſingenſis* * ſaith, that he had read over the Actions of the Roman Emperors, and that he could not find any excommunicated and depoſed from his Government before *Henry* the fourth; which perhaps may be true, that of the Weſtern Emperors none were depoſed by the Pope before *Henry* the fourth; but that many Emperors and Kings growing wicked and looſe, or by their Idleneſs becoming unprofitable have been caſt off, this is moſt true, and this ſometimes hath been done by the authority of the Popes of *Rome*, as *Urſpergenſis* ſaith, and he inſtances in *Leo* the Greek Emperor, that *Gregory* the third made all *Italy* to re-

* *Lib* 6. *cap.* 35.

volt from him, and that he deprived him of his Kingdom. And the Hiſtorian adds, *talia quoque alibi plerunque leguntur & noſtris temporibus facta fuiſſe cernuntur*; that ſuch things were frequently reported in other places, and had faln out in his time.

Chron. Abb. Urſperg. p. 208.

The Story of *Childerick's* being depoſed by Pope *Zachary*, and that *Pipin* who before had been the *major domo* by the Popes appointment was made King, is well known; for the Hiſtorians generally ſay that this was done *Authoritate Romani Pontificis*, * and this inſtance is recorded by *Gratian*, *cap. Alius*, 15. *qu.* 6. And *Hoſtienſis* in his ſumme upon the Title *de Hereticis*, bids us note that Temporal Princes for their neglect of Government may be thus uſed, and that he gathers from the Decrees. * The inſtance of *Gregory* the Seventh, depoſing *Henry* the Fourth, is commonly obſerved; and though he was choſen meerly by the *Romans* without the Emperors conſent, which he himſelf in his Epiſtle to the Emperour acknowledges to have been unlawful, and therefore begs both his pardon

**Urſperg p. 123. Rheginо. Chron. lib. 2. Lambert Shafnaburg. Annal. an. 750.*

* *Cap. ſi quis d inceps*, 17. *qu.* 14.

pardon and confirmation; yet no ſooner was he well ſettled, but he Excommunicates the Emperour, and when the Emperour procured the Counteſſe *Mathilda* the Popes great Friend with ſeveral of the chiefeſt of *Italy* to intercede for him, and they only beg'd that he might be abſolved from the Excommunication, and then that he would when and where the Pope pleaſed, anſwer to what was laid to his charge; and if he cleared himſelf according to the Popes determination to hold his Kingdom; or if he could not clear himſelf, to loſe it. The Pope was unwilling to yield to this motion, but being overcome by their importunity, grants that if we was truly penitent, he ſhould deliver up the Crown and the Enſigns of his Kingdom to the Pope, & profeſs, that for the contumacy he had been guilty of he was unworthy to Rule: This ſeemed too hard, but all that could be obtained of him was this, that he might come into the Popes preſence and ſhew his Repentance by ſubmitting to his Decrees. The Emperour came to the Caſtle of *Canuſium*, and leaving all his

Company behind, and laying aſide all tokens of Royalty, he ſtood barefoot for three days together before the Gates of the Caſtle, faſting from Morning till Evening, and on the fourth day being let in, he could not get off his Excommunication, ſave upon theſe conditions, that he would appear at a General Council where the Pope ſhould appoint, and anſwer to the Accuſations againſt him, and ſubmit to the Popes Sentence, and in the mean time till the Cauſe were heard, he ſhould not uſe any Royal Ornaments, or Tokens of Royal Dignity, nor meddle with the Adminiſtration of Publick Affairs, nor with the Revenue further than for the neceſſary maintenance of himſelf and his Family, and that all who had ſworn fealty to him ſhould be free before God and Man from the bond of their Oath; but if he failed in any of theſe things, that the abſolution from the Excommunication ſhould be void, that he ſhould be taken for convict, and confeſſing that the Princes of the Empire without more ado might chooſe another Emperour. Theſe were the hard conditions

ditions which the Pope forced the Emperour to accept, as *Lambertus Schafnaburgenſis* relates, * and when the Emperour upon after-thoughts being ſenſible of the diſgrace put upon him, and fearing he ſhould be deſerted by the *Italians*, who were exceedingly vexed at this Agreement, refuſed to perform what the Pope required; after this the Pope Excommunicates him again, depoſes him from the Empire, and in the form of Excommunication he deſires all the World to take notice that it is in the power of the Pope to take away Empires, Kingdoms, Principalities, and the Poſſeſſions of all men, and give them to whomſoever he thinks fit. * *Innocent* the Fourth in the Council of *Lions* depoſes *Frederick* the Second the German Emperour, and not only abſolved his ſubjects from the Oath of Allegiance to him, but by his Apoſtolical Authority forbad that none ſhould hereafter obey him as King or Emperour. *Lewis* of *Bavaria* was Excommunicated by *John* the 22th. and deprived of the Empire as far as words would do it, becauſe he had taken on him the

* *Annales. p. 536. Edit. Argentor.*

* *Baron ad annum 1080. n. 8. Platina in Greg. 7.*

the Imperial Power in *Italy* before his Coronation, and though he oft desired absolution, yet he could not obtain it: * the writings which past betwixt the Pope and Emperour were to be seen long after as the Author of those *Paraleipomena* reports, and in them the Pope brag'd exceedingly that he had this power both to appoint and depose Emperours and Kings; and this was no more than *Celestin* the Third shew'd by that significant Ceremony of putting on the Crown on *Henry* the Sixths Head with his feet, and kicking it off again, which as *Baronius* * says, was to mind the Emperour by his example that it was in the Popes power to give, preserve, or take away the Empire if there be cause for it. I need instance in no more than the famous Bull of *Pius* the Fifth against Queen *Elizabeth*, where he says that God hath made the Bishop of *Rome* Prince over all people, and all Kingdoms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, consume, plant, and build; & in that Bull, he by the fulness of Apostolick power declares her to be an Heretick, deprived of her Title to the Kingdom, and

*Paraleipomena rerum mem. in Lud. Bavaro.

* Tom. 12. an. 1191. n. 10.

and all dominions and dignity whatever, and by that Bull did deprive her, and forbad her Subjects to obey Her, her Mandates and Laws, and thoſe who ſhall do contrary are involved in the ſame curſe. Here is enough to ſhew that this is the conſtant claim of the Popes: and though the Image of both Churches would fain moderate this harſh paſſage, that this was done out of a particular provocation from the Engliſh Clergy, who frequently called the Pope Antichriſt, or elſe a miſinformation of the Queens caſe and the Catholicks, and that the Popes by ſuch cenſures did not diſturb the peace of *Edward* the ſixth, of the Kings of *Scotland*, *Sueden*, *Denmark*, &c. and that action doth not touch the Catholicks and the preſent ſtate *: yet all he ſaith is nothing, for whether the Pope did this upon ground, or no ground, whether he ſpared other Princes, and depoſed only Queen *Elizabeth*, it will really nothing leſſen this charge, for ſtill he claims this power; and if out of the fulneſs of Apoſtolick power he might deſpoſe her, why then

* Image of both Churches, pag. 372.

then may he not if he thinks fit depoſe others? What he hath done to one he may do to another, and how then can any Princes be ſecure longer than he pleaſes? Perhaps he is wiſer than to ſhew his Teeth where he knows that he cannot bite; or to provoke Princes, who are ready to bury his Bulls in the fire, and care no more for him than he doth for them: but ſo long as the Pope claims this power, and pretends that he can depoſe Princes, and excommunicate thoſe that obey them, no Princes can be ſecure: the Lyon lies ſtill at preſent, but he is a Lyon ſtill, and may ſoon rouſe himſelf when he ſees the prey in his power; if the Pope ſees an opportunity, he will ſtill purſue the claim; as quiet as the Popes are, yet if the waters once be troubled, they will be fiſhing. As ſoon as the Iriſh Rebellion broke out, a Nuncio was preſently ſent thither: and what was indeavoured by a great party of the Iriſh for the Popes intereſt to the excluſion of the Kings right, is well known. Further the Popes have not only claimed this exorbitant power, but the Romiſh Prieſts

Prieſts have generally maintained it; if they have done otherwiſe, they are but few, inconſiderable, condemned by the Court of *Rome* for Machiavellianiſts, Politicians, Court-Flatterers, and Neutrals, ſuſpected of Hereſie, and commonly excommunicated for their moderation, and ſhould they fall into the Popes hand, in danger of the Inquiſition: but the moſt and moſt noted in their Church maintain this power of depoſing Princes, inſomuch that *Suarez* * ſaith, It is as certain that the Pope may depoſe Princes, as that the Church cannot err in Faith and Manners. I wonder indeed at the bold aſſertion of ſome late Writers, who deny that this is the Doctrine of any of their party, yea, and tell us, that the whole order of Jeſuits have diſavowed *Mariana*'s poſition, and determined Categorically the contrary, ſo ſaith *Philanax*, pag. 94. and gives us ſome paſſages out of ſeveral Jeſuits, who diſown this poſition, that it is lawful to attempt againſt the life of a Prince; but this he only tranſcribed out of the Image of both Churches, though I queſtion whether either

* *Def. fid. Cath. adv. ſect. Anglic. l. 7. c. 23. n. 16.*

either the one or the other ever ſearched into thoſe places; for if they did, they would have ſeen the quite contrary. It is not lawful ſay ſome to attempt againſt the life of a Prince; that is, for private perſons; but what ſay they if the Pope ſhould declare that he is no King? and command any perſon to deſtroy him? Do not they allow it may be done by publick authority, and that authority to be in the Pope? The Anſwerer of *Philanax* hath plainly diſcovered this fraud:* they tell us it is a ſlander of the Proteſtants againſt them, that they allow Subjects to murder their Princes. I grant it is a ſlander, but how? For Subjects to kill their Princes without authority ſay they; but for Subjects to do it with the Popes authority is no murder, no more than the execution of a man when he is condemned by the Judge. I confeſs they forbid any perſon to attempt againſt the life of a Prince, but 'tis then before the Pope paſs ſentence againſt him, and declares him deprived of his Principality; but if the Pope hath once paſt ſentence againſt him,

* Cap. 5.

him, and declared him no Prince, and required his Subjects to deſtroy him, what then? Some indeed were ſo bold as to maintain that it was a matter of Faith, that whatſoever Prince ſhall depart from the Catholick Religion, and would draw others from it, he doth immediately fall from all Power and Dignity, even before the Popes ſentence, and that his Subjects are free from the obligation of any Oath of obedience to him as their Lawful Prince, and that they may and ought if they be ſtrong enough, to eject ſuch an one from the Government of Chriſtians: ſo ſaid *Parſons* *, and others who are accounted more moderate will not ſcruple to tell us, that *latâ ſententiâ quiſque poſſit inſtitui executionis miniſter,* that after ſentence is paſt any one may be appointed to execute it, ſo ſaith *Suarez* out of *Soto* concerning a Lawful Prince, that governs tyrannically; and if a King be depoſed by the Pope, he may be expelled or ſlain, by thoſe who are commiſſioned for that purpoſe, and if he command none to execute this ſentence, then the next Succeſſor may

* *Philopat.* p. 149.

may execute it, (and what ſecurity then hath any Proteſtant Prince, if his next Heir turn Catholick?) if there be no Heir found, then his Kingdom muſt do it: * though *Suarez* is not ſo hot headed as *Parſons*, to bid all riſe, and take arms againſt their Heretical Princes, for he doth not allow a private perſon to kill a Prince depoſed: but this is only unleſs the Pope command that private perſon, or that there be a general commiſſion in the ſentence; but if the Pope commands any private perſon to kill the Prince, or if there be ſuch general words in the ſentence, impowering the Subjects to riſe, then let me ſee how Princes can be ſecure? *Suarez* in that diſcourſe which he writ againſt the Oath of Allegiance hath taught the Engliſh Catholicks, that Kings may be depoſed by the Pope, that if we ſpeak of the ſentence of excommunication in common form, a Prince excommunicate, during the excommunication, is deprived of the right of commanding his Subjects, and if he force them, they may reſiſt and that by a juſt war *. That after a King

* *Defenſ. fidei Cath. l. 6. c. 4. n. 18.*

* *Suarez def. fid. Cath. l. 6. c. 6. n. 24.*

is

is lawfully depoſed, he is no more a King, nor a Lawful Prince; but if he do retain the Kingdom by force, he is a Tyrant in *titulo* *; that after ſentence he cannot hold it by a juſt title: therefore from thence-forward he may be uſed as altogether being a Tyrant, and conſequently be ſlain by any private perſon: that if Subjects do ſwear to diſcover any treaſons or conſpiracies againſt their King, this only binds while he is not depoſed; for if he be depoſed then it is unjuſt to require ſuch a promiſe, and ſacrilegious to ſwear it; and in this caſe they muſt rather keep faith with the Common-wealth, or community of Subjects oppreſſed with force, than with a Tyrant that unjuſtly oppreſſes them, * and though it be not told to him in confeſſion, yet he would not have a Prieſt, or any other perſon to diſcover it, becauſe of the natural obligation to ſecrecy when a thing is juſt, and neceſſary to the common good of ſociety, &c. And now for any to tell us that it is diſowned by the whole order, ſeems ſtrange, when *Suarez* * ſaith, it is the common

* *n.* 14.

* *Suarez ibi c.* 3. *n.* 8.

* *C.* 6. *n.* 28.

consent of the Catholicks, and all Catholicks admit this power in the Pope. To tell us, that all whom he had ſeen, agree in one ſentence, and that he had curiouſly ſearched for it, * ſeem incredible; when *Suarez* ſaith there is no diſſenſion about this point among Catholick Divines, and that none can ſhew any that do contradict this truth; for even thoſe Schoolmen, who ſeem to reſtrain this power of the Pope, as *Ockam*, *Gerſon*, &c. never denied this power of depoſing Kings that were Hereticks or deſtructive to the ſafety of their Subjects: * and when King *James* had ſaid, that this power over Kings was not determined in any General-Council, and that the Schoolmen to this day do quarrel about it; he anſwers that both this is plainly falſe, nor could the King affirm it, unleſs when he could not himſelf read the Councils or Schoolmen, ſome Proteſtant had deceived him *. I inſtance in theſe paſſages of *Suarez*, whom the Biſhop of *Conimbra* in his Licenſe to the Book calls the Mr. of this age, and another *Auguſtin*; and the Univer-

* Image of both Churches, pag. 368.

* *Def. fid. Cath. l. 6. c. 6. n. 8.*

* *c. 6. n. 27.*

Univerſity of *Complutum* in their cenſure ſaith, that there was nothing in this work different from their judgement, and that they had all the ſame words, the ſame thoughts, and the ſame opinions about theſe things; and therefore I muſt needs believe that theſe Writers who thus mince the Romiſh opinions, concerning the power of depoſing Kings, either never read their own Authors, or elſe concealed theſe Doctrines upon ſome deſign: For if theſe things were really known to be ſo, Princes could never be ſecure nor ſafe againſt the deſigns of the Romiſh party. Some perhaps who indeavoured to court Princes into a toleration or ſome favourable opinion of the Romaniſts, were loth to ſhew the worſt ſide; ſome things they muſt deny, other things they muſt extenuate; they muſt pretend that the Proteſtants belyed them, and raiſed theſe ſtories to make them odious; for if their opinions were inconſiſtent with the ſecurity of Kings and Princes, then they ſaw Princes would unwillingly habour Snakes in their Boſoms, or tolerate them

who were good Subjects only while the Pope pleaſed, or that thought themſelves only bound to obey a Prince excommunicated and depoſed by the Pope till they had ſtrength to reſiſt him, or that judged themſelves no way bound to diſcover Treaſons or Conſpiracies, notwithſtanding all Oaths which they had taken, if the Pope declare him either for hereſie or male-adminiſtration to be deprived of his Kingdom. Suppoſe the King be not excommunicate by name, yet if he be an Heretick as the Romaniſts call us, then he is included in the general excommunication in the *Bulla cœnæ*, he is declared by the Council of *Conſtance*, excommunicate *ipſo facto*, and deprived of all dignity and honour; and where is his ſecurity then? Suppoſe it is neceſſary that he muſt be declared an Heretick, and to have incurred the penalty of the Canon, what then muſt he do? for then his next Heir may deprive him of his Crown: The Son may ſupplant the Father, as the *German* Emperor *Henry* the fifth did: the Younger may juſtle out the Elder Brother; thoſe who are

far

far off from the Crown, may yet now ſtep betwixt it and thoſe who are nearly related to it. The Pope may legitimate a Baſtard, and put by the Lawful Son, ſo ſaith the reply of *T. H.* to *Widdrington* * out of *Covarruvius* and *Molina*. If the Lawful Succeſſor neglect to out the heretical Prince, then the Kingdom it ſelf may do it, or deſire the aſſiſtance of neighbouring Princes. * This is their Doctrine which expoſes the Crowns of Princes to inſecurity and hazard. I muſt needs ſay it concerns theſe men to make the beſt of a bad matter, and to mince thoſe expreſſions which ſound ſo harſhly; but we have proof enough that this is the avowed Doctrine of the Romaniſts. This is that Doctrine which the Jeſuits who came into *England* in Queen *Elizabeths* time were bound to maintain; for among the Caſes of Conſcience wherewith they were furniſht, this was one, that if they were askt, *credis Romanum Pontificem Elizabetham potuiſſe exauthorare?* Whether they believed the Pope could depoſe Queen *Elizabeth?* They were to anſwer *non obſtante mor-*

* *Cap.* 12.

* *Suarez def. fid. Cath. l.* 6. *c.* 4. *n.* 19.

tus metu, credo: without fear of death that they do believe it, for this question pertaineth to the faith. Bishop *Bilson* * affirms that this was the fifty fifth article among their Cases of Conscience. This was the Doctrine of Cardinal *Allen* (one of the chief instruments in founding the Seminary of *Doway*) in his defence of the English Catholicks; that it was the right and power of St. *Gregory* to deprive Princes, and that it had been the faith of Christian men ever since our Country was converted: and though he doth seem to disallow private mens taking up of arms for Religion, yet after the Popes sentence, *certare pro Catholicâ Religione præclarum est*, then it was commendable to fight for Religion: and he propounds the twenty fifth of *Numbers* for an example, that the people should not run to arms upon their own heads, but by the direction and advice of the Priests: so that still Princes are little safer; for if the Priests blow the Trumpet, then the people may take arms with a safe Conscience, and their Insurrection passes for

* Of Christian subjection, pag. 583.

holy

holy zeal. And 'tis observable that *Parry* confest that he was confirmed in his resolution to kill Queen *Elizabeth* by Cardinal *Allens* Book, which taught him that Princes excommunicate for heresie were to be deprived of Kingdom and Life. This was the Doctrine of *Sanders*, who going into *Ireland* to encourage the Rebellion there, was forced to wander up and down the Mountains and Bogs, and finding nothing to sustain him, at length perished with famine, and in his Scrip were found certain Orations and Letters written to hearten the Rebels, and promising large rewards from the Pope and King of *Spain*. This was the common Doctrine all her time maintained generally by the Priests and Jesuits, as our English Chronicles affirm. *Campian* after his conviction being demanded whether he would stand for the Queen or the Pope, if he should send an army against her, plainly professed that he would be of the Popes side, and witnessed it under his hand *. And about this time in the Seminaries beyond Sea amongst other disputations, it was concluded

Baker Chron. in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*.

* *Baker ibid.*

cluded that the Pope hath ſuch fulneſs of power by Divine Right over the whole Chriſtian world, both in Eccleſiaſtical and Secular matters, that by virtue thereof it is lawful for him to excommunicate Kings, abſolve their Subjects from the Oath of Allegiance, and deprive them. There was indeed a Book writ by ſome Romaniſt, exhorting that party to attempt nothing againſt their Prince, and to uſe only the Chriſtian Weapons, of Prayers and Tears, Faſting and Watching, but this was nothing (ſay our Hiſtorians) ſave to make the Queen and her Council ſecure. For about that time the Treaſon of *Savage* was plotted, who being perſwaded by one *Gifford* a Doctor in Divinity, that it was meritorious to take away the lives of Princes excommunicate, vowed to kill the Queen. And though this Treaſon is coloured over by the Image of both Churches as a mixt action, that this was not ſo much for Religion, as the advancement of the Queen of Scots, whoſe Title they did more favour than Queen *Elizabeths*. But I wonder then

Baker ibi.

that

that after her death none of them ſhould ever appear for the Title of King *James*; when ſhe was dead all her right devolved to him: but I may ask, as the Anſwer to the late Apology of the Papiſts doth to his Adverſary, pray Sir name us thoſe Papiſts, or but one ſingle perſon of them, that after the Title came to King *James*, acted or ſuffered for him, or ever ſet his Title on foot againſt her; but had the plots been meerly on the account of the Title, then there had been as much reaſon to ſtand for the Son, as they had done for the Mother. Our Hiſtorians agree, that when King *James* proved to be a Proteſtant, they were as buſie to put him by the ſucceſſion as to deſtroy Queen *Elizabeth*; for in the Breves of *Clement* the eighth which he ſent when Queen *Elizabeth* grew old, he commanded the Catholicks here to admit none (though never ſo near in blood) to the Crown, unleſs he were a Catholick, and would ſwear to maintain the Catholick Religion; which was in effect not to admit King *James*, who was

not

not a Roman Catholick. And that theſe Plots and Conſpiracies were meerly on the account of Religion, and in purſuance of the papal intereſt, appears from the Famous Gun-powder Treaſon; for after King *James* came to the Crown, he makes peace with the *Spaniard*, he remits the execution of Penal Laws againſt the Papiſts, and carries himſelf ſo favourably to all, that he tells the Parliament in his Speech to them *anno* 1605. that theſe men could not alledge ſo much as a pretended cauſe of grief, but did this meerly on the account of Religion, and that one of them now in their hands did confeſs that there was no cauſe moving him and them, but meerly and only for Religion. And when *Fauks* was taken, he would give no other reaſon for this Plot, but that he was moved for Religion and Conſcience ſake: that the King was not his lawful Soveraign, becauſe he was an Heretick: and that it was meerly for the advancement of the Catholick Cauſe. *Winter* alſo confeſt, as the Lords of the Council atteſted in that diſcourſe, which was pub-

Diſcourſe of the late intended Treaſon.

publiſhed by Authority. Now though I do not condemn all the Romaniſts for this Treaſon, which I believe many of them did abhor; yet as King *James* ſaith, * it cannot be denied that it was the blind ſuperſtition of their errors in Religion, that led them to this deſperate Device. This was proved, that theſe Conſpirators were animated to this deſign by the Popes Breves which *Garnet* ſhewed *Catesby*; that none but Roman Catholicks were in this Plot; that far more appeared in the Rebellion when it broke out at *Dunchurch*, than were diſcovered to be privy to the Plot. How far it was the deſign of that party cannot now be known; for Plots when they miſcarry are commonly diſowned, none will confeſs themſelves to be in a conſpiracy, when they can do no more but hang themſelves for talking: the forwardeſt perſons lay the deſign, but the wiſer commonly ſtand behind the Curtain, till they ſee how it ſucceeds.

* His Majeſties ſpeech to the laſt ſeſſion, *&c.*

Indeed I cannot but admire that men ſhould at ſixty years and upwards queſtion the truth of this Plot, as if they knew

knew better the transactions of those times than they that lived in them. The confessions of several of the Plotters were published, attested by several Commissioners of the chiefest Nobility; the actions succeeding the discovery of the Plot were notorious, being pursued upon their rising by the Sheriffs of *Warwickshire* and *Worcestershire* to one Mr. *Littleton*'s house: several of them were slain; *Winter* was taken; the execution of several of the Plotters was before multitudes. The Writers of those times, whether English or Forrainers, acknowledge the Plot to have been laid by some Roman Catholicks for the destruction of the King and Parliament. *Garnet* the Provincial of the Jesuits executed for concealing the Plot; and all his excuse for the concealment was, because this Treason was only revealed to him in confession, and this he acknowledged at his death, as *Bellarmine* saith from the attestation of several witnesses: and yet some now question the truth of this Treason, notwithstanding this plain evidence some whisper it in private, others openly

openly publiſh it, that there was no ſuch Plot, but only a device to keep down the Papiſts. The truth is, thoſe that think 'tis a ſtain in their blood, would fain have the attainder off the file; thoſe who think 'tis a diſgrace to their party would fain wipe it off, by pretending it was a Court Fiction; they are loth to have any of them thought guilty, leſt Princes for the future ſhould be jealous of any of that party, by ſome of which they had been endangered already. 'Tis the miſery of Princes that no Plots are believed to be true, if they miſcarry, and when they are acknowledged to be true, 'tis too late to prevent them. If there were no ſuch Plot, how came the Powder under the Billets? How came they into a Room which *Piercy* hired? How came *Faux* to ſtand at midnight without the doors of the Houſe? And what did he with three matches, and other inſtruments about him for blowing up the Powder, which Sr. *Thomas Knevet* found when he ſearched him? What reaſon to disbelieve the confeſſion which he and *Winter* made?

made? For if the thing they confeſt was only to blind the world, then it would be ſtrange that they ſhould frame a lye to hang themſelves; and that they did confeſs it, was atteſted by ſeveral of the Privy Council, who took their examination, ſubſcribed it, and afterwards their confeſſions were publiſhed in Print. If there were no plot diſcovered, why did they take arms afterwards? Why did they all meet at *Dunchurch*, at Sr. *Everard Digby*'s lodging, and publickly invite perſons to joyn with them for the advancement of the Catholick Cauſe? And when they were chaſed thence, why did they reſiſt the Sheriff of *Worceſterſhire* when he purſued them? If the deſign of blowing up the Parliament Houſe was laid in the dark, yet the riſing upon the diſcovery of it was publick and manifeſt; that ſome of thoſe who did riſe were purſued, ſome ſlain, ſome taken, this is notorious. Laſtly, If *Garnet* was executed for concealing this Treaſon, and confeſt it both under his hand and at the Gallows, and only excuſed himſelf that the particulars were

re-

revealed to him in confeſſion, and therefore he ought not to diſcover it; and upon this very account he is highly eſteemed as a Martyr for the ſeal of confeſſion. It is evident then that there was ſuch a Treaſon. Know it which way ſoever he did, whether in confeſſion or out of confeſſion, then there muſt needs have been ſuch a thing, for he could not know it, if there had been no ſuch thing. All theſe circumſtances I have mentioned, that I might ſilence thoſe ſuggeſtions which ſome Romaniſts have made againſt the truth of this ſtory. It is not only a ſecret whiſper among themſelves, but ſome venture to talk it openly. Firſt, They deſigned (ſay our Hiſtorians) to lay it on the Puritans, afterwards they laid it only on ſome few Deſperado's, but now they are come to it, to tell us that there was no ſuch thing at all; all was but Court-Policy to keep down the Papiſts, which is in effect to ſay, that King *James* was a moſt cruel Tyrant, to put his Subjects to death for a treaſon of his own contrivance, and the whole ſtate ſuch wretch-

wretched Politicians to cozen God and the world by a perpetual thanksgiving, for a deliverance from a Plot of their own making. That there was such a Treason then is evident, and that occasioned by this Doctrine of the Popes power in depriving Princes, whom he calls Heretical, of their Crowns and Dignities; and therefore still this Doctrine of the Popes power must needs be inconsistent with the security of Civil Societies. Further, this was the Doctrine of *Bellarmine*, *Becanus*, *Suarez*, &c. in those discourses which they writ for the instruction of the English Catholicks about the Oath of Allegiance. For King *James* observing the conspiracies against Queen *Elizabeth* and Himself, and that the Treasons by that Party were occasioned by pretence of the Popes power in deposing heretical Princes, and absolving Subjects from their Allegiance, and that he could never be secured of his Subjects obedience even in temporal things, if they did judge that the Pope, his declared enemie, could free them from that duty which he lookt on as natu-

natural from Subjects to their Princes, therefore he frames that Oath, in which they ſwear that the Pope neither by himſelf, nor by any other authority of the Church or See of *Rome* hath any power or authority to depoſe the King, or diſpoſe of any of his Majeſtys Realms and Dominions, and that the Pope cannot free his Subjects from their obedience to him, or give them any liberty to take up arms againſt him, *&c.* and that they do abhor this as an Heretical poſition, That Princes deprived or excommunicated by the Pope, may be depoſed and ſlain by their Subjects, *&c.* Now though King *James*, the beſt Interpreter of that Oath, which he preſcribes for his own ſecurity, profeſſes, that he doth only require by this Oath from them Civil Obedience; and becauſe that his Subjects cannot perform Civil Obedience to him, ſo long as they own that the Pope may depoſe Kings, abſolve their Subjects from their obedience, and give them power to riſe againſt their Soveraign; therefore King *James* requires the rejection of theſe poſitions, and that they ſhould ſecure him

by their Oath againſt the fear of any future diſturbances. Now theſe Writers condemn this Oath, and diſallow the taking of it; for ſtill they plead, this is to deny the power of the Pope; this is to deny what is univerſally granted among Catholicks, that the Pope hath power to puniſh Heretical Princes by temporal puniſhments: and ſo *Bellarmine* ſaith, in his anſwer to the Kings Apology, *Inter omnes Theologos & Juriſconſultos convenit poſſe Pontificem maximum Hæreticos Principes jure deponere & ſubditos eorum ab obedientiâ liberare*, &c. That all Divines and Lawyers are agreed, that the Pope hath this power to depoſe Princes, *&c.* So *Suarez* * alſo, that to deny the Pope this power is contrary to the Doctrine received by the whole Church; and that to ſay that the Pope hath not power of releaſing ſubjects from their Oaths upon reaſonable cauſe, (and that muſt be judged a reaſonable cauſe which the Pope judges to be ſo) is *contra Eccleſiaſticum morem, Conciliorum generalium uſum, & approbationem, contra Doctorum*

* *Def. fid. Cath. l. 3. c. 23. n. 16. & l. 6. c. 2. n. 5.*

rum Catholicorum conſenſum, * againſt the cuſtom of the Church, the uſe of General Councils, and the conſent of Catholick Doctors: and further, to affirm that the Pope hath not power to abſolve them from that particular Oath, is an heretical propoſition, contrary to that power of binding and looſing, given to St. *Peter* as the Catholick Church hath always underſtood, and practiſed *; and that this propoſition of the power of the Pope is founded in Scripture, declared by the Authoritie of Popes and Councils, and received by common conſent. * On theſe and the like grounds *Suarez* pleads that the Oath ought not to be taken, and if it be taken, that really there needs no abſolution from it, for it binds no man; or however (if any did think it bound them) the Pope hath abſolved them, when he declared the Oath to be unlawful, and contrary to their Salvation *. I have been the more prolix in giving the opinions of the chiefeſt Writers of the Romiſh Church, who have ſtudiouſly handled this point, which was ſo much agitated betwixt us

* Sua ibi, n. 7.

* Suarez l. 6. c. 5. n. 2.

* n. 3.

* c. 5. n. 5.

and the Romish Catholicks, because many now either conceal this Doctrine or at least mince it: I abhor to affix Doctrines to any Party which they do not own, or to charge them with any opinions which they decry: if any say it is not their Doctrine, then let them answer their own Writers, who so stifly assert that it is; and if it is their Doctrine, then let them shew how it can be consistent with the security of civil Societies.

Fourthly, I instance in the Doctrine of Exemption of the Clergy from the jurisdiction of secular Princes both in their Estates and Persons: We do not deny but Princes have out of a peculiar respect to the Clergy, allowed them many Priviledges, as the Heathens have indulged much to those who were immediately employed about the service of their Gods, and as the Roman Emperours since they became Christian, bestowed many Favors and Immunities on the Clergy, as may be seen in the Imperial Laws: but yet these priviledges were not granted all together, but some Emperours priviledged them in one thing,

some

ſome in another, ſome freed them from
many perſonal Tribute, but left them to
pay any Taxes charged on their Lands.
So *Bellarmine* * obſerves it to have
been the Law before *Juſtinians* time.
ſome freed them in Civil and Criminal
Cauſes from appearing before any ex-
cept the Archbiſhop of *Conſtantinople*
and the *Præfectus Prætorii*. So *Martian*
priviledged the Clergy of *Conſtantino-*
ple. * But in the Provinces *Leo* and *An-*
themius ordain that the Prieſts and
Clerks of what degree ſoever, ſhall be
Convented before the Ordinary Judges
(that is) the Governours of the Provinces,
and if they come to *Conſtantinople*, then
before the *Præfectus Prætorii**. There is
alſo a Law of *Juſtinian*, that in Pe-
cuniary Cauſes the Buſineſs ſhould be
tryed before the Biſhop, but if he could
not decide it, then it ſhould be ended
by the Civil Judge; and if it be a civil
Crime (the Gloſs there explains it of Mur-
der, Forgery and Adultery) then the
Cauſe ſhould be heard by the Civil Judg,
and the Clergy-man ſhould not be pu-
niſhed, before he was degraded by the
Biſhop *.

* Diſp. de exempt. Cleric. c. 1.

* L. cum Cler. Cod. de Epiſc. & Cler.

* L. Omnes S. in hac C. de Epiſc. & Cler.

Biſhop.* Sometimes the priviledges were extended, ſometimes reſtrained, as the Emperors were able to ſupport their Power and Dignity againſt the Papal Uſurpations; for the Popes labouring all they could to advance their own Power, endeavoured to exempt the Clergy from any dependence on the ſecular Magiſtrate and make them ſolely depend on themſelves: and therefore at length they brought *Frederick* the ſecond to publiſh that Law for the abrogation of all Statutes and Laws againſt the Liberty of the Church, and to forbid the laying of any Taxes on any Churches or Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, and that no ſuch Perſon ſhould be drawn either in a civil or criminal Cauſe before any ſecular Judge *, which was in effect to free half his Subjects from their Obedience, to weaken the Imperial power, and to deprive himſelf of the aſſiſtance neceſſary for the ſupport of his Government: and yet the Popes plead for theſe exemptions of the Clergy, not as a bounty but as a duty, not as the favour of Princes, but as what they are obliged to do by the Law of God:

* Authentic. Cler. quoq; C. de Epiſc. & Cler.

* Conſtit. Fred. 2. de Stat. & conſuet. contra Libert. Eccl.

God: but what they do thus challenge as a duty, and what priviledges they have allowed the Clergy by the Canons, ſhould they be ſtrictly practiſed, are inconſiſtent with the ſecurity and ſafety of civil Governments. Eccleſiaſtical Liberty is in the Romiſh ſenſe a ſtrangely comprehenſive word, and which uſually the Popes make uſe of to increaſe their Power and advance thoſe who immediately depend on them. Whatever Laws Temporal Princes make for the ſecurity of themſelves, may perhaps indirectly hinder the Eccleſiaſtical Liberty, and yet if they do indirectly hinder that Liberty, they fall under the cenſure of the *Bulla Cœnæ*, and are lyable to the penalty of the Canon Law. If we now would know the meaning of this word, or what is properly an hinderance of Eccleſiaſtical Liberty, they tell us, that if Princes make any Laws by which the Clergy are made more fearful, this is interpreted a violation of Eccleſiaſtical Liberty*: but who ſhall be Judge in this Caſe? who ſhall Judge whether any Law makes them more fearful and diſcourages them? if themſelves, then whatever Princes ſhall

* Bartolus in Authent. Caſſa C. de ſacroſanct. Eccl.

determine to be conducing to the publick safety, though they design no prejudice to any sort of men, but what really conduces to the good of their whole Kingdom, yet this Law may be made void and null: if so, then Princes shall not be permitted to provide for the safety of themselves and their Kingdoms, and the wisest contrivances for their own security and self preservation against the incroachments of others, shall be wholly frustrate and null. If Princes forbid any persons to travel out of their Country without special Licence, if they forbid any Ships to pass out of their Ports for six moneths, if they forbid them to carry any money to Foreign parts at enmity with them, this may indirectly be a prejudice to the Clergy, for some or other may be hindred in prosecuting an Appeal to *Rome*, in visiting the threshholds of Saint *Peter*, or paying some duties to the Roman Court, and therefore on these pretences those Prohibitions must be null. If Princes forbid the payment of any Taxes imposed on the Clergy by the Pope or his Legates (which in case the Pope do side with the Enemies of the

Crown

Crown is neceſſary to be done) this preſently muſt be void, becauſe it is contrary to that temporal Power which the Popes have over the Clergy in all Countries. So that now if the Pope and Princes ſhould quarrel, which often falls out, when their Territories joyn together, which way ſhall Princes uphold their Rights and defend themſelves? If the Pope may impoſe Tributes and Taxes on the Clergy (which *Suarez* * ſays, he may) without the conſent of any Prince, then it's eaſily in his power to weaken any Prince with whom he contends, and impoveriſh thoſe that oppoſe him. If Princes forbid this payment of Taxes upon the Popes demands, then preſently ſay theſe men, this is to oppoſe the Eccleſiaſtical Liberty, this is to take Cognizance of Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, and to meddle with thoſe who are not under their power. So that Princes by this means are put to a ſtrange *Dilemma*, either to yield to the Popes demands, or elſe if they uſe any means to hinder his incroachments, they are preſently excommunicated for Infringers of the Eccleſiaſtical Liberty. I will inſtance in two

* Def fid. Cathol. l. 4. c. 2. n. 7.

two things which according to their Doctrine are much inconsistent with the publick Peace and Security, the Exemption in Criminal Causes, and the Exemption from any publick Taxes and Charges.

First, I instance in the Exemption in Criminal Causes from Secular judgment. The Romanists pretend this Exemption to be by Divine Right; *Suarez* * saith, this is a most certain assertion received by all Catholick Writers, and cannot be denied without denying some Principle of Faith: *Bellarmine* * pleads for this Exemption both by humane and divine Law: the same is affirmed in general of the immunity of the Clergy, that it was instituted by Divine Ordination and Canonical Sanctions *, and had also been owned by the Council of *Lateran* under *Leo* the tenth *: This business was one of the great grounds of the Quarrel betwixt *Paul* the fifth and the *Venetians*: for the *Venetians* had imprisoned *Brandolinus Valdemarinus* Abbot of *Narnesa*, and *Scipio Saracinus* Canon of *Vicenza*; the former of which was accused for poysoning several persons, particularly a Priest his domestick,

* Suar. ib. c. 15. n. 1.

* Disp. de Cler. cap. 1.

* Conc. Trid. Sess. 25 c. 20. de Reformat.

* Conc. Later. Sess. 25.

domeſtick, and for living in continual uncleanneſs with his natural Siſter, and for many other Crimes; the later was accuſed for having diſgracefully torn the Mandates of the Magiſtrates of *Vicenza*, which had been ſet upon the Chancery of the Biſhoprick, for the ſecurity of the Writings and Accounts of the Biſhoprick, which were kept there: Now though the *Venetians* did plead a long Cuſtome from the Foundation of their City, the Priviledges granted to them by ſeveral Popes for the puniſhment of ſuch groſs Offenders, which Priviledges were yet extant among their publick Records; and though they did plead the neceſſity for peace ſake of puniſhing ſuch Offenders: yet *Paul* the fifth did declare it was a breach of the Eccleſiaſtical Liberty, and that unleſs they did within twenty four dayes after notice pblickly revoke all their Decrees, and blot them out of their Regiſters, and promiſe for the future to abſtain from all ſuch Decrees againſt Eccleſiaſtical Liberty, Immunity and Juriſdiction, and deliver up thoſe Eccleſiaſtical Perſons to the *Nuncio*, then

then he doth excommunicate the Duke and Senate of *Venice*; and if they continued three days excommunicate, then he puts under interdict the whole dominion of that State. This also was the great quarrel betwixt *Henry* the Second and *Thomas Becket*, for there being many complaints made of crimes committed by the Clergy, no less than an hundred being indited for murders and robberies; the King required they should be tried befor his Judges as Lay-men were; the Archbishop opposed it as against the liberty of the Church; the King pleaded that it was the custom of the Land; and to prevent further differences required the Clergy to own these customs under their hands and seals. which they did at *Clarendon*; and *Becket* among the rest, omitting those words, *salvo ordine suo*, which he had for a while insisted upon; but afterwards retracting what he had done, he procured the Popes absolution from this obligation*. This exemption the Romanists challenge *jure divino*, but should it be granted, I cannot see how it can consist with

*Dicto anno 1164. Matth. Paris. Major in anno 12.

with the ſafety of Princes, and quiet of Kingdoms. For, 1. It muſt needs occaſion endleſs jars betwixt the Clergy and Laity; when for the ſame crimes the one ſhall be puniſht and the other not; when if a Lay-man ſhall kill a Clergy-man, he ſhall both incur Excommunication from the Eccleſiaſtical Magiſtrate, and death from the Temporal; but now if a Clergy-man ſhall kill a Lay perſon he cannot by the Canons be puniſhed with death. The uſual puniſhments inflicted by the Canons, are ſuſpenſion, deprivation, irregularity, *&c.* And if the crime be ſo heinous that it is puniſhable with death among the Laity, yet the Clergy-man can only be adjudged to perpetual impriſonment, or put to perpetual penance, which yet is ſeldom executed: and he cannot be degraded, and delivered up to the Secular power, except in caſe of Hereſie, counterfeiting of the Popes Letters, and conſpiracy againſt his own Biſhop *. If then the puniſhments are thus unequal, then the Laity are leſs ſecured from wrongs by the Clergy, than the Clergy are from the

* *Gloſſ. in ad abol. Extra. de Hæreticis. Hoſtienſis in ſumma. ibi.*

the wrongs by the Laity. And further then the Magistrate cannot protect his Subjects from the injury of the Clergy, nor prevent the damage and inconvenience which may befall the Laity, which is in effect to set the Clergy and Laity by the ears, and make them perpetually enemies. 2. It will occasion the frequent commission of notorious crimes, for impunity will invite offences, and men will less matter to wrong others, when they know the priviledge of their order will exempt them from punishment. Usually where the love of duty doth not dissuade, the fear of punishment doth deter men from many offences; but the less they shall be punisht, they are less afraid to commit the fault: and if they know before-hand the worst that can happen is only some small censure which reaches not to life or limb, some Ecclesiastical punishment which upon profession of repentance may be easily taken off, it will imbolden men to sin. And this is the case here; for if a Clergy-man be guilty of never so many faults, he knows the worst, no lay Magistrates

can

can convent him before them, no Officer of any Lay Court can arreſt him, no temporal Judge can detain him in cuſtody, and whoever lays violent hands on a Clergy-man, though under any pretence whatever, is liable to an excommunication; and if he be brought before an Eccleſiaſtical judge, the puniſhment is ſmall, the moſt he can do is to condemn him to a perpetual penance, which yet may in time be got off; and if the Eccleſiaſtical Magiſtrates neglect to redreſs theſe faults in the Clergy, the Laity have no power to help themſelves; by this means there is a great occaſion given of frequent crimes; many are hardned in their wickedneſs, and their priviledges conduce much to encourage miſchief. 3. It indangers the ſafety of Princes, for the rebellion of a Clergy-man is no Treaſon, (as they ſay) becauſe he is not properly the Kings Subject,* and that he is not bound by the directive power of Secular Laws, nor is there any obligation on the Conſcience by virtue of thoſe Laws to obey them*. And therefore *Suarez* makes them only bound

* *Eman. Sa. Aphoriſm. verbo Clericus.*

* *Suarez def. fid. Cathol. l. 4. c. 17. n. 18.*

bound to obſerve the Laws of any Nation, either by the force of reaſon, that is, ſo far as they judge them uſeful for the publick good; or by the force of the Canons, that is, ſo far as the Popes do allow the Clergy to obſerve theſe Laws. But then how can Princes be ſafe if the Popes do no allow them to obſerve the Laws of Princes? Where's the Princes ſecurity if they may plot, raiſe tumults, break the peace, and ſtill can be in no fault, becauſe they are not his Subjects, nor are bound to obſerve any of his Laws further than the Pope pleaſes? Suppoſe a quarrel riſe betwixt the Pope and any temporal Prince, ſuppoſe the Pope claim his eſtate, or pretend any forfeiture of the Crown to him, how ſhall Princes be ſecure? For neither are the Clergy of thoſe Countries bound by any Laws for the ſupport and maintenance of their natural Prince longer than the Pope pleaſes; neither have theſe Princes power to puniſh them if they do not. If they hold correſpondence with the Kings enemies, if they ſend intelligence to them, if they

furniſh

furniſh them with men and mony, ſtill it is no Treaſon. The Pope (ſay they) hath a direct dominion over the Clergy, and therefore they are bound to aſſiſt him againſt all perſons whatever, and cannot be puniſht for doing this by any Secular Magiſtrate, becauſe he hath no Juriſdiction over them. Suppoſe a war with the Pope, a Prince can neither command them to aſſiſt him, nor reſtrain them from aſſiſting his enemies: If he baniſh them as ſuſpected perſons; if he diſarm them as dangerous perſons; if he forbid them any intercourſe with foreign parts, all this is conſtrued as a breach of Eccleſiaſtical liberty; and Princes for doing thus are *ipſo facto* excommunicate. Thus according to this Doctrine the ſafety of Princes is indangered, and either they muſt tamely ſubmit to the Popes pleaſure, or they have no way to ſecure themſelves againſt the Clergy that take his part. According to this Doctrine they are bound to harbour Snakes in their boſoms, and yet are liable to be puniſhed if they indeavour to pull out their ſting.

2. The exemption from any taxes or publick charges; 'tis plain that the Canon Law forbids payment of any taxes or tributes to temporal Princes, and under pain of Excommunication and Interdict forbids those who have temporal jurisdiction to impose any tributes, taxes or any kind of exactions under any colour or pretence whatsoever, on any Churches or Ecclesiastical persons, for their Houses, Lands, or Possessions, * and this, saith he, is expounded, not only concerning the Goods or Lands which they have in right of their Churches, but of their own patrimonial estate; and so saith *Suarez*, that the Canonists usually teach. * This exemption from all taxes is pretended by the Canons to be derived from the Law of God: and so *Boniface* the eighth affirmed, *Ecclesiasticæ personæ & res ipsarum jure divino à secularium personarum exactionibus sunt immunes*; and on this reason he most strictly forbids the imposing of any taxes. In the *Clementine* constitutions *, all former Laws against those impositions are renewed, and though the Popes might

* *Lancelottus Inst. Jur. Can. l. 2. tit. 20. de immun. Eccles.*

* *Def. fid. Cath. l. 4. c. 24.*

C. quanquam. de censibus in 6.

* *Clem. unica. de censibus.*

might impoſe what Taxes they pleaſed on the Clergy, yet they would not the Laity ſhould do ſo, and therefore though the Kingdom was in great danger, and the Clergy ſaw a neceſſity of contributing to the publick charge, yet they were not allowed to contribute without the Popes conſent firſt had; * and upon this ground the Clergy when theſe Laws were firſt made, did refuſe to pay any Taxes, and ſtood ſtifly on theſe Immunities. The quarrels in the time of *Edward* the firſt about this thing are memorable in our Chronicles, and the original of them was from the decrees againſt laying Taxes on the Clergy; *Winchelſee* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* told them, that it was forbid by the Council of *Lions* for the Clergy to pay any thing without the Popes leave. The next time therefore that the King demanded aid for his Wars againſt *Scotland*, the Clergy by virtue of this exemption would not contribute to his Wars as the Laity did; which ſo much incenſed the King, that he locked up the Barns of Clergy-men, and excluded them from his protection, ſo that

* *Cap. adverſus. Extra. de Immun. Eccl.*

any might sue them, but they could sue no man. And it is observable in our *English* Histories, that when the rest of the Clergy submitted to pay a proportion of their revenew to the King, all the answer which *Winchelsee* made was this, that we have under God the universal Lord, two Lords, a spiritual Lord the Pope, and a temporal Lord the King, and though we ought to obey both, yet rather the Spiritual Lord, than the temporal; and therefore using no other words than these, *Salvet unusquisque animam suam*, he rose up suddenly and departed *, but for this contumacy the King seized on his goods.

* *Godwin.* Catal. of Bishops of *Canterb.* in *Robert Winchelsy.*

Thus stood the case of the Clergies exemption from all Taxes and Payments to the secular Magistrate, the Papal Clergy on pretence of Divine right labouring to free themselves from these payments and leaving the laity to indure the burden. And it is observable, that in the Council of *Trent*, when the Princes did eagerly insist on a reformation of the Clergy, the Clergy propounded a reformation of the Princes, in which they renewed all the constitutions of Popes,

and

and holy Canons in favor of Eccleſiaſtical Immunity, commanding under pain of *Anathema* that neither directly nor indirectly, under any pretence whatever any thing be conſtituted or executed againſt the perſons and goods of the Clergy, or againſt their liberty; and this is decreed notwithſtanding any priviledges or exemptions, though they have been time out of mind. * So that by the Articles of this reformation Eccleſiſticks ſhould not be forced to pay any Taxes, Gabels, Subſidies, though in the name of a gift or loan, either in reſpect of their Church-goods or patrimonial eſtate. Now this priviledge which thoſe Canons give to the Clergy are inconſiſtent with the ſafety and ſecurity of Kingdoms: if we conſider, 1. The Lands and Eſtate which the Clergy may poſſeſs; for if the greateſt part of the Land become Church-land, or if their proportion far exceed the laity, and yet muſt neceſſarily be free from all Taxes and Contributions, then this muſt needs be inconſiſtent with the ſecurity of the Kingdom. It is plain, that if ſeveral

* Hiſt. of the Council l. 8. p. 771.

Princes had not by the ſtatutes of *Mort-main*, reſtrained the Clergy from acquiring any more Lands without their conſent, the whole Land of thoſe Kingdoms might by degrees have come into the hands of the Clergy. And they pleading their exemptions the whole burden muſt have been caſt on the laity; and they not being able to raiſe Monyes proportionably to the publick neceſſity, the Kingdom muſt have been expoſed to deſtruction. In *France* the Clergy (as it is computed) have the fourth part of the Kingdom; and yet amongſt the * Decretals there is one of *Alexander* the fourth, which expreſly forbids the *French* to impoſe any Taxes, Collections or Exactions upon Churches or Eccleſiaſtical perſons, or to require them of them for their houſes, lands, or other poſſeſſions whatſoever heretofore had or purchaſed, or hereafter to be got and purchaſed, *&c.* If then they have the fourth part now, and muſt not pay for that which they have, or for that which they ſhall have, then the people muſt needs be impoveriſhed, and the Kingdom left without ſufficient ſupport.

* *Cap.* 1. *de Immunit Eccl. in* 6.

Review of the Council l. 7. c. 2. n. 14.

2. If

2. If we conſider the perſons that are capable of this priviledge, that is, all Clergy-men whether in the higher or lower Orders, even thoſe that have only the firſt tonſure, are comprehended under this priviledge. All that are *Clerici*, and where the words are without reſtriction, in favourable cauſes they are to be extended, and that all *Clerici* are to have this priviledge, is, ſays *Suarez*, * without Controverſie among Catholicks: now there being ſo many that are reckoned for *Clerici* in a large ſenſe in the Canon law, * and theſe all exempted for their goods and lands from any Taxes whatever, and alſo it being not allowed that they ſhould renounce their priviledges; it follows that this exemption muſt be inconſiſtent with the ſafety of Kingdoms; for if there be no means, or not ſufficient left to defray the publick charges, if the moneys of the Nation be drained and there cannot be enough raiſed for the publick defence, either the Clergy muſt be bound to contribute and pay Taxes, or elſe the Nation muſt needs be expoſed to ruin: If theſe im-

* *Def. fid. Cath. l. 4. c. 26 n. 3.*

* *Cap. cum contingat. Extra. de ætate & qualib. ordin. prov. Conſt. cap. quia quidam. de temp. ordinand. verbo Clericum.*

munities ſtand good according to the rigor of the Canons, then the ſafety of the Nation muſt needs be indanger'd; for if the laity cannot, and the Clergy are not bound, then there is no means left to provide for the publick neceſſities. Indeed they will tell us, that the Canons do require the Clergy to contribute, where they ſee that the laity are not able, * and that though they forbid tributes and taxes as tokens of the ſubjection of the Clergy to ſecular Princes, yet not as neceſſary expenſes for the publick ſafety. For in ſuch caſes they ought to Contribute. But now when I conſider the limitations and reſtrictions wherewith they clog this conceſſion, I ſee not how all which they grant can conſiſt with the ſafety of the Kingdom: for 1. They never make the Clergy properly bound as a duty but as a courteſie, and though they do Contribute for the publick ſafety in which the Clergy as well as the laity are concerned, yet ſtill ſay the Canons, the laity muſt receive this as a kindneſs, *Laici humiliter & devotè recipiant cum gratiarum actione.* * As if it were their

* *Cap. non minus. Extra. de Immuni. Eccleſ.*

* *Cap. adverſus. Extra. de Immuni. Eccl.*

their courteſie only, that they ſuffer not the Nation to be deſtroyed, or a kindneſs to the laity that they contribute any thing to keep their own throats from being cut. 2. They do not allow the Clergy to contribute ſave only, *ubi non ſuppetunt laicorum facultates*, where the eſtate of the laity is not ſufficient. But now it is hard to prove that the eſtate of the laity is not ſufficient, and if the Clergy are not bound unleſs it appear that the laity are not able, the Clergy will hardly ever be induced to pay, and the Kingdom muſt be indanger'd. 3. They do not allow the Clergy to contribute, unleſs where the Biſhop & Clergy conſent. * If then the ſecular Magiſtrate ſhall declare that there is an imminent neceſſity, yet ſtill the Clergy are forbid to pay without the Biſhop and Clergy in their Dioceſan Synod, or at leaſt as others expound it, without the conſent of the Biſhop and Chapter of his *Cathedral*: but now in many caſes it may be impoſſible to procure a meeting of the Biſhop and Clergy, or perhaps they may not judge (as the State does) that there is any neceſſity

* *Cap. adverſ. Extra. de Immun. Eccl.*

neceſſity of raiſing Moneys; yet in no caſe are they bound to contribute without the Biſhop and Clergies approbation. 4. Suppoſe the Biſhop and Clergy do acknowledge that there is a neceſſity of a general contribution, and that the Tax be allowed by them, yet if any Clergy-man ſhall refuſe to pay, the laity can only intreat and deſire, but they cannot compel him, and if the Biſhop will not force him to pay, there is no remedy but by a recourſe to the Biſhop's Superior, which may be difficult and tedious, and perhaps little to the purpoſe: ſo that ſtill theſe reſtrictions ſhew that the contributions of the Clergy according to theſe principles are little available to the publick ſafety. *Laſtly*, Though it be reaſonable that the Clergy ſhould conſent to the publick Taxes, as well as the Laity, and that there can be no reaſon why the Laity ſhould aſſeſs the Clergy without their conſent, more than the Clergy ſhould aſſeſs the Laity; yet here's one thing more in the Canons that though the Biſhop and Clergy do conſent to the Tax, yet ſtill without the

the Popes conſent the Clergy are not bound to contribute, * *Propter ignorantiam quorundam Rom. pontifex priùs conſulatur*, &c. Thus *Innocent* the third determined; and *Gregory* the fourth in his Bulls *de Cœna Domini*, thunders out an excommunication againſt thoſe who impoſe any Taxes, Collections, Payments or other charges upon Clerks, Prelates, or other Eccleſiaſtical perſons, or upon the goods of Churches, Monaſteries, or other Eccleſiaſtical Benefices, or upon the fruits, rents, and revenues thereof, without ſpecial and expreſs Licence from the Pope of *Rome*. Thus neither can the State lay a Tax on the Clergy, nor the Clergy conſent to pay a Tax without the Popes conſent: and now if no Tax can be lay'd without the Popes conſent, nor the Clergy allowed to pay it without the Popes conſent, and that though themſelves do acknowledge a neceſſity; then this reſtriction ſpoyls the former conceſſion, and this priviledge they pretend to by the Canons, muſt be inconſiſtent with the publick ſafety. For ſuppoſe the neceſſity be occaſioned

* *cap. adverſus ioi.*

Review of the Council l. 7. c. 2.

casioned by the Pope himself, suppose the Nation be invaded by the Pope's forces, 'tis unlikely, that he will allow them to contribute against himself, and unless he do allow it, the Clergy are not bound: by this means then the safety of the Nation must be indanger'd. Or suppose the necessity arise any other way, yet it will be long before they can consult the Pope, and receive his consent, so much time may be spent that the remedy comes too late to help the disease. Now though some pretend that this Canon does not hold in case of urgent necessity, that is, as if it be for one tax or payment, or for a short time, in that case necessity hath no Law; yet if the Tax be for any continuance the Popes approbation must be had, so sayes *Suarez*: * And yet this is more than the Canon allows; for the Canon in the Council of *Lateran* allowed the Clergy to contribute only in a case of necessity, and of this necessity themselves were judges; but there is afterwards a restriction in the *Cap. adversus*; that because some out of imprudence did contribute, that is, without

* *Def. fid. Cath. l.* 4 *c.* 26. *n.* 18.

without juſt cauſe or any real neceſſity, and becauſe they might pretend a neceſſity when there was none, therefore the Canon provides that the Pope ſhould alwayes be adviſed with, and though the Biſhop doth judge there is a neceſſity, yet ſayes the Gloſs, * he ought not to contribute unleſs firſt the Pope be conſulted; and in the *Cap. Adverſus, ibi,* all conſtitutions, and determinations concerning theſe Taxes, which are ſuppoſed to be without the Popes privity, are declared void and null. This is the hard caſe now of Kingdoms, if the Clergy are hindred from the immoderate increaſe of their revenues to the prejudice of the Laity, then the Laity incurrs the ſentence of excommunication. If they have got never ſo much, no revenue of the Clergy can upon any account be aliened without the Popes conſent, no Tax impoſed without his privity; what neceſſity ſoever there is, as they or the Laity judge, yet the Clergy can give nothing without the Pope. Thus no civil Government hath any power to preſerve it ſelf or raiſe means for its own maintenance

* *Gl. in c. non minus. Ext. de Immu. Eccl. verb. tantam.*

tenance or ſupport longer than the Pope pleaſes. If any ſhall except againſt this, and ſay that this doctrine of exemptions is not inconſiſtent with the ſecurity of civil Governments, for in thoſe Countryes which are intirely Popiſh the Nation flouriſhes and the State is preſerved? How is this inconſiſtent with the civil Government of *Spain*, where the Clergy enjoy both large revenues and great priviledges? And why ſhould we think the liberties and immunities are dangerous to the State, when there is no ſuch thing, where theſe liberties are ſo fully enjoyed? I anſwer; That were this doctrine as ſtrictly practiſed, as it is ſtifly maintained, the peace and ſafety of the Nation muſt be indanger'd. In ſome places they give the Clergy leave to talk, but they will not deſtroy themſelves to ſatisfie the Popes demands. At preſent the rigor of theſe immunities is much reſtrained by concordats, cuſtoms, and priviledges, which Princes plead, and either the Popes are willing to gratifie Princes w th theſe things, or Princes are reſolved to take them if the Pope will

not

not give them. Some Princes are too potent to be reſtrained by Papal threats, and no wonder if the Pope allows them thoſe priviledges which he is ſure they will have without him. The *French* King perhaps will not tarry for the Popes conſent: and when the Popes forbid any perſons to lay impoſitions on the Clergy, the Lawyers conceit that the King of *France* is always excepted, * and that this is his ſpecial priviledge; but the Popes indulge the *French* no more than others in this point. *Alexander* the fourth, * expreſly forbids the *French* to impoſe any Taxes on the Clergy, and ſince the Council of *Trent* maintains theſe immunities to be by divine ordination, to what purpoſe ſhould they talk of this priviledge? If theſe immunities are by divine ordination, then to infringe them will be a ſin, and there can be no pretence of a priviledge to juſtifie a ſin. This is the doctrine which the *Romaniſts* maintain, and whoever infringes theſe liberties, breaks, as they ſay, Gods Law, and are liable to the ſevereſt cenſures of the Church. And there-

* Review of the Counc. l. 7. c. 2 n. 14.

* *Cap.* 1. *de Immunit. Eccl. in* 6.

therefore 'tis unreasonble to reply, that in some Popish Countrys these liberties are not found so inconsistent with the publick security, for even in some Popish Countrys they will not permit them, and more value their own security, than the Pope's thunders; and therefore though they own the Popes spiritual power, yet they will not submit to his decrees which are usurpations on the secular power, and inconsistent with the civil State. Perhaps this doctrine might not prejudice the State, when the Pope out of fear, or love is willing to gratifie Princes; but if an angry Pope that hath power to back his humour should get the seat, they would soon see that the liberties of the Church which the Popes challenge are incompatible with their security. In quarrels with the Pope if the Clergy should disown to be subject to that temporal Prince who contests with him, if they refuse to contribute for the defence of the Nation, if they foment any secret designs at the Popes command, then the strictest Romanist would presently see the insecurity of that King-

Kingdom. Were the Pope of the *French* ſide, the *Spaniard* would not ſcruple the aſſeſſing of the Clergy for the publick neceſſities without the Popes leave; ſhould the Popes purſue the deſign againſt *Naples*, which is (as they call it) a fee of the Church, ſhould they deſign to out the *Spaniard* as 'tis ſayd the *Barberini* in *Urban* the eighth's time once intended, they would not think theſe immunities allowable, where the State may be indanger'd. When *Paul* the fourth had revoked the grant of the half and quarter fruits which his Predeceſſors had granted to the Emperour for the mainteinance of the War of *Germany*, ſtill as the Author of the Hiſtory of the Council tells us, they forced the Clergy by impriſonments and ſequeſtrations to pay, and at this day ſhould the Pope be their enemy they would not queſtion to take without his liking, which they now have with it, or elſe in the end they would have no means left to preſerve themſelves. 'Tis indeed the prudence of the Popes to forbid Princes medling with the goods and perſons of

Clergy-men, as being contrary to Eccleſiaſtical liberty, and yet the Popes for the maintenance of their own temporal Dominions never ſcruple at the violation of it, and what is this but to gain the opportunity of increaſing their own power, and getting the ſword into their own hands, when others have layd it down? If the Pope may command the Clergy of any quality whatever to carry doſſers with earth on their backs for the repair of the walls, as *Paul* the fourth did, when he was threatned by the Duke of *Alva*, I ſee not, but (as *Padre Paolo* obſerves) Governours of ſtrong places may do the like, for the Pope as a temporal Prince can have no more power to oblige the Clergy, than other Princes have, nor are the Clergy more concerned in the preſervation of the Popes Territories, than they are for thoſe places where they receive protection and maintenance. If the Pope may alienate Church-lands for the defence of his own Territories, which he holds as a temporal Prince, I ſee no reaſon why an equal neceſſity may not juſtifie Princes in the

Hiſt. of the Council, p. 404.

the like alienation, for the temporal eſtate of the Pope is no more *Jure Divino*, than the eſtate of other Princes, therefore there is no reaſon for the one to imploy them for a publick defence more than the other: but here's the myſtery of it; the Popes may uſe any means to perſerve their own Dominions, but Kings may not; which muſt needs make way for the ſecurity of the Popes, and the deſtruction of the temporal States.

CHAP. II.

Some more Conſiderations from the doubtfulneſs, and uncertainty of ſome Doctrines required of us by the Romiſh Church to be profeſt and believed.

I Inſtance in the Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Maſs. The Council of *Trent Seſſ.* 22. *Can.* 1. *de ſacrif. miſſæ*, pronounces an Anathema againſt them that deny, that there is Offered in the Maſs a true and proper Sacrifice: and *Can.* 3. againſt them that ſay, it is not a propitiatory Sacrifice, and that it ought not to be Offered for the Living and the Dead, for ſins, puniſhments, ſatisfactions and other neceſſities; and in the profeſſion of faith by *Pius* 4. they are bound to ſwear that they do profeſs, that there is Offered to God in the Maſs, a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead. But this Article which they thus require to be profeſt and believed, is uncertain and doubtful; the difference

difference betwixt us and them, lyes not about the acknowledgement of a Sacrifice in the Eucharist, but whether there be a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice; we do not contend about the calling that Sacrament a Sacrifice, though the Scripture does not give it that name, for since Sacraments are sometimes named from the things they represent, and since in the Eucharist there is a representation and commemoration of the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross; we do not differ about a word, nor will trouble the peace of the Church about words and names, which antiquity hath and might use in a lawful sense: In that Christ is evidently set forth Crucified, and in the celebration of that Sacrament, there is a shewing forth the Lords death till he come; and therefore the members of the English Church have not scrupled to call it a Sacrifice, a spiritual Sacrifice; a pure offering: The question is, whether it be a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice as the Council speaks? and in that sense in which they explain this Doctrine, it is uncertain and doubtful, and therefore we cannot

be obliged to profeſs it.

1. They enjoyn us to profeſs that here is a true and proper Sacrifice: now what they mean by a proper Sacrifice muſt firſt be explained. They tell us it is an external Offering to God alone, by which ſome ſenſible and permanent thing is by a lawful Miniſter, with a myſtical rite, Conſecrated and changed: ſo ſays *Bellarmin**.

* *L. 1. de Miſſa c. 2.*

And though a Sacrifice may ſometimes in a large ſenſe be defined to be any good work whereby we pleaſe God; but properly, to a proper Sacrifice, five things are required: 1. That he who Offers the Sacrifice be a Prieſt: 2. That the thing Offered be ſome ſenſible outward thing: 3. That that ſenſible thing be changed and deſtroyed: 4. That either explicitely or implicitely it be referred to the honour of God: Laſtly, that the place on which it is Offered be conſecrated to this purpoſe; ſo ſays *Becanus**: if then the thing Offered be not a ſenſible thing, or not done by a Lawful Prieſt; or if that ſenſible thing be not changed and deſtroyed, 'tis not a true proper Sacrifice; we muſt therefore conſider how far theſe qualifications

* *Sum. Schol. Theol. c. 25. qu. 2.*

cations and conditions are found in the Maſs: and if it be doubtful and uncertain whether all theſe conditions of a true proper Sacrifice be found in it, then it is ſtill uncertain whether there be a true proper Sacrifice, and by conſequence we cannot be bound to profeſs this for an Article of faith.

1. They require in a true proper Sacrifice a ſenſible permanent thing: if there be an outward Offering, then there muſt be ſome ſenſible thing Offered; but now what or which is this ſenſible permanent thing which is here Offered, it is wholly uncertain: ſome ſay it is only the Bread and Wine, and not the Body and Blood of Chriſt; for that properly is Sacrificed, which is changed and deſtroyed, but the Bread and Wine only are changed, and deſtroyed: others ſay it is only Chriſt which is Offered; and ſo ſays the Council, that in this Sacrifice of the Maſs, the ſame Chriſt is here ſacrificed unbloodily, which Offered himſelf on the Croſs bloodily *: But then Chriſt here is not a ſenſible thing; either this Body of Chriſt which they here Offer muſt be ſome thing

* Seſſ. 22. cap. 2.

perceivable by the ſenſes, and that they dare not ſay; or elſe the Body of Chriſt is not the thing here Offered: If the matter of this Sacrifice muſt be ſome ſenſible thing, then how can that be the Body of Chriſt, which is not perceived by any outward ſenſe to be under the ſpecies of Bread and Wine; but rather againſt ſenſe is believed to be under them? To free themſelves from this perplexity, they tell us, that Chriſt as exiſting under the Sacramental ſpecies, is the thing offered; But how is this? not properly, (ſays *Becanus*) as the matter which muſt be ſuppoſed to the action of Sacrificing: but what elſe do we mean by the thing Offered, but the matter to which the action of Sacrificing is referred? for if I Sacrifice, I muſt Sacrifice ſomething; and that which I do Sacrifice is the matter, which muſt be ſuppoſed alwayes before the action of Sacrificing. Thus then according to their Doctrine, Chriſt under the ſpecies is the thing Offered; but ſtill not properly as the matter of the Sacrifice; (*i.e.*) he is the thing Offered, but not as the thing Offered; he is properly the matter

of

of the Offering, or elſe here's an action without an object, an Offering of nothing: and he is not properly the matter of the Offering, which is a plain contradiction. To clear themſelves from this perplexity, *Becanus* tells us further, That Chriſt under the Sacrameneal ſpecies is the thing Offered as the term of the action of Sacrificing; but ſtill this will not clear the perplexity; for, ſuppoſe that Conſecration (as he fancies) be the action of Sacrificing, (which yet will appear afterwards to be a moſt intricate and perplexed conceit) and that the *terminus ad quem* be the Body of Chriſt brought by the ſaying of thoſe words, *hoc eſt corpus meum*, to exiſt under thoſe ſpecies: but ſtill where is this *res ſenſibilis?* this thing which may be perceived by ſenſe? Still here muſt be a viſible Sacrificing an inviſible thing, an external Offering of a thing which I muſt believe to be there, but cannot by any ſenſe perceive to be there; an Offering of a thing ſenſible, which yet is inſenſible. Suppoſe that Chriſt is the term of the action of Sacrificing, as he exiſts under the Sacramental

cramental ſpecies, yet even there he is inviſible, and even there we cannot ſay that he is *res ſenſibilis*. Well, but there is another ſetch behind to defend this proper Sacrifice, and that is this, that it is enough that the ſpecies of Bread and Wine which contain the Body and Blood of Chriſt are things ſubjected to the ſenſes: ſo ſays *Azorius* *, and therefore if we are askt whether the ſpecies of Bread and Wine, or rather the Body of Chriſt be the matter of this Sacrifice? We anſwer (ſays he) that the Body of the Lord contained under the ſpecies is the matter of the Sacrifice: or we may take *Becanus* his anſwer *, that the Sacramental ſpecies of Bread and Wine do intrinſecally pertain to the thing Offered, ſo that Chriſt with theſe ſpecies make one ſacramental *ſuppoſitum*; and as he is viſible by theſe ſpecies, is the thing Offered: but ſtill, ſay I, he is not viſible by theſe ſpecies: when we do ſee the colour or figure of the bread, we do neither ſee really the colour or figure of the Body of Chriſt. They all tell us that the accidents of Bread and Wine are not ſubjected in the Body of

* *Inſt. Moral. lib. 10. c. 18.*

* *Sum. Schol. Theol. t. 2. q. 5.*

of Chriſt, nor can be called the accidents of his body: we may ſay this is the colour or taſte of the Bread, but we cannot ſay this is the colour or taſte of Chriſts body; ſo that ſtill I cannot ſee, how Chriſt is viſible by theſe ſpecies; and therefore how can he be the thing offered? They may ſay according to their tenents, that they believe he is contained under the ſpecies; but ſtill as he is under the ſpecies, he is not *res ſenſibilis*; for ſince they are not accidents of his body, they cannot repreſent his body to the outward ſenſes. Thus then the body of Chriſt is not here a ſenſible thing, and therefore what is properly the ſenſible thing here offered is uncertain: and by conſequence the doctrine of this proper Sacrifice is uncertain and doubtful.

2. In a true and proper Sacrifice there muſt be ſome proper action of Sacrificing; but wherein lyes this proper action of Sacrificing, they are wholly perplexed and uncertain. It is a condition in a true proper Sacrifice, that that ſenſible thing which is offered be changed and deſtroyed, but it is uncertain and doubtful whether

whether there be any action here by which this ſenſible thing ſhould be changed, and deſtroyed. Some think the true nature of this Sacrifice conſiſts of three actions of the Prieſt, Conſecration, Oblation and Sumption; ſome make it to lye in four actions, in the Conſecration, Oblation, Fraction and Sumption. Some add to theſe the commixtion of the ſpecies. Some ſay it is found in two actions, Conſecration and Oblation; ſome, in one, that is, Oblation; others ſay, it is only in Conſecration: ſo perplexed are they about this action of Sacrificing, as we ſee by the ſeveral opinions recited in *Azorius* *, yet they will bind us to believe that here is a true proper ſacrifice, when themſelves are ſo uncertain wherein the reaſon of this ſacrifice conſiſts. There are nine opinions concerning it, as *Malderas* * reckons them up; and yet though themſelves cannot tell us, how the Body of Chriſt is properly Offered, or which is this proper action of Sacrificing, which is ſo neceſſary to a true proper ſacrifice, yet ſtill we muſt believe what they require. The uſual opinion is, that the Conſecration be-

* *Inſt. Moral. l* 10. *c.* 19.

* *Tract.* 10. *de Juſt. & Jure c.* 3.

belongs to the eſſence of the ſacrifice; but even in this they differ, for ſome think it pertains to the eſſence of the ſacrifice, becauſe by the Conſecration there is made a true and real change of the Bread into Chriſts Body, and a true Sacrifice requires ſuch a change whereby the thing ceaſes to be; others, becauſe by this Conſecration Chriſt is truly though myſtically and unbloodily ſacrificed, for ſince the ſeparation of the Body and Blood is a true and proper ſacrificing; and that by the words *hoc eſt corpus meum*, the Body without the Blood is placed upon the Altar, and by the words *hic eſt ſanguis meus*, the Blood is placed there without the Body; therefore they explain the proper action of ſacrificing by the conſecration in this ſenſe. *Bellarmine* * diſlikes theſe ways and propounds another. There are three things (ſays he) found in the conſecration of the Euchariſt, in which lyes the true real ground of a Sacrifice, 1. A prophane and earthly thing is made holy. 2. That thing thus made holy is offered to God. 3. That thing thus offered is ordained to a true real and external mutation

* *De Miſſa l.* 1. *c.* 27.

tation and deſtruction. But take now all theſe ways and it is ſtill wholly perplexed and uncertain how really in this Conſecration of the Euchariſt there is any external change and deſtruction of the thing offered: For 1. In the making a prophane thing to be holy, that may be without any external ſenſible change; for this ſanctification is only an external denomination which makes no change really in the object. Thus many things are call'd holy by the dedication of them to the ſervice of God, without any outward change in the things themſelves, for they remain what they were before: ſo that now in the making it holy, here's none of this real outward change: beſides, if there were more than an outward denomination in this making holy, yet the ſame numerical thing which was prophane, does not remain when it is made holy, and therefore to be ſacrificed as an holy thing; for the Bread and Wine are not made holy but annihilated according to him, and therefore either here is no external change, or elſe the ſame thing is not now ſacrificed which was prophane: and

ſo

ſo *Bellarmin* acknowledges there, that it is not the Bread which was profane, that is properly ſacrificed, but that which was made of the Bread; and yet further, 'tis as perplexed and uncertain how that which was made of the Bread, that is the Body of Chriſt, can be in this ſenſe properly ſacrificed; for as the Bread which was profane, cannot be ſaid to be made holy, becauſe 'tis annihilated by repeating the words of Conſecration, no more can the body which always is holy, ever be ſaid to have been profane: and therefore that which was made of the Bread cannot be ſaid to be ſacrificed. 2. Neither in the placing the Sacrifice on the Altar by the words of Conſecration is this outward change and deſtruction wrought, for the effect of the conſecration is to bring the Body of Chriſt to exiſt under thoſe ſpecies, but the exiſting of it under the ſpecies is rather a thing previous to the action of Sacrificing, as the laying the Sacrifice on the Altar was not the ſacrificing it; or however ſtill here is no ſenſible change which yet is neceſſary to this outward Sacrifice. Laſtly, According

to *Bellarmin*'s way, the true ground of the Sacrifice must lye in this, that the thing which is offered is ordained to a true real destruction; (*i.e.*) it is by this means made to be food, made capable of being eaten, and therefore may be destroyed. But I ask, in eating the Consecrated Wafer, is Christs Body destroyed or no? They tell us that the Body of Christ here is the same Body with *that* which is Glorified, and therefore it is now capable of no passion or suffering, of no harm or destruction. If there be a proper Sacrifice, there must be a destruction of the thing sacrificed: for all the Sacrifices mentioned in Scripture, whether of things animate or inanimate, were necessarily some way or other to be destroyed: and so much *Bellarmin* acknowledges*. But here is no destruction, no real hurt of the thing offered, and therefore still it is uncertain whether it be a true proper Sacrifice, since the Body of Christ is not capable of being destroyed as those true proper Sacrifices were. There is one little shift still which some use, that the Body of Christ loses in being eaten, not its natural being,

* *L.* 1. *c.* 2. *de Missa.*

being, but its ſacramental being, that it ceaſes to be ſenſible food, (*i. e.*) it ceaſes to be under thoſe ſpecies of Bread and Wine: but what real deſtruction of the Body of Chriſt is this, to ceaſe only to be where it was? for a thing is not deſtroyed by leaving its place, nor loſes any thing but the reſpect to that *ubi* where it was: Whether the Clothes be off or on, yet the Body is the ſame, and no man will ſay it's any deſtruction of the Body, though it be deveſted of the garments which incloſed it. The ſacramental eſſence is no more according to their explication, than the body exiſting under thoſe ſpecies, as the body under the clothes, which is meerly an accidental being. And is all this noiſe of a real change and deſtruction of the thing offered come to no more than this? Here's the deſtruction of an Imaginary being, or at moſt a deſtruction of a reſpect betwixt the Body of Chriſt, and the outward forms. Here's ſtrange unintelligible things; ſometimes the Deſtruction is made by Conſecration, which is as much as that a thing is deſtroyed by being made to be, and the converſion of

the Bread into the Body, whereby the Body is made to exist under these species, should be the external destruction of the Body; sometimes the destruction is in the eating, but others will tell us that a Sacrifice is compleated before the eating of it, and that the thing sacrificed was sensibly changed, before they partook of the Sacrifice; so that now where's this outward change which is the proper nature of sacrificing? Or if eating be this Sacrificing, yet where's the real destruction of the Body? here's no alteration in the Body, no harm to the Body; and whether it be supposed under the species, or no, yet still here's no destruction of the Body; whether the outward species be eaten or no, yet still here is no sensible change of the Body; that is neither broken with the teeth, nor chewed, nor swallowed, nor can nourish our bodies; so that when we have tryed all wayes, still this is unintelligible, still this doctrine of a true, proper sacrifice, is uncertain and doubtful.

3. There must be a true Priest; for a proper

proper Sacrifice and a proper Prieſthood are relatives. Now (ſaith the Council) Chriſt in the laſt Supper declaring himſelf to be appointed a Prieſt for ever after the order of *Melchiſedech*, offered his body and blood under the ſpecies of bread and wine; and under theſe ſymbols delivered it to the Apoſtles, whom he then made Prieſts of the New Teſtament; and commanded them and their ſucceſſors in the Prieſthood by theſe words, *do this in remembrance of me*, that they ſhould offer, *&c.* * And the Council Anathematizes thoſe who ſhall deny, that by theſe words, *do this in remembrance of me*, the Apoſtles were appointed to be Prieſts. * Thus they make Chriſts *Melchiſedechian* Prieſthood to conſiſt in the offering of his body under the forms of bread and wine. Again, they tell us, Chriſt could not be a Prieſt for ever after this Order, unleſs he left ſucceſſors to offer the like Sacrifice. Again, they ſay, that by thoſe words, *do this in remembrance of me*, he made the Apoſtles Prieſts, and commanded them and their ſucceſſors to offer his body and blood;

* *Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 1.

* *Can.* 2. *ibi.*

ſo that Chriſt the true Prieſt by the miniſtry of the Prieſt his ſubſtitute, doth offer this Sacrifice. But now when we weigh all this heap of intricacies and perplexed Doctrines, we ſhall ſee that this Doctrine is wholly uncertain and doubtful. 1. That *Melchiſedechs* Prieſthood conſiſted in the offering of bread and wine, is wholly uncertain: For, 1. It is not certain that *Melchiſedechs* Sacrifice was only bread and wine, though the Scripture ſaith, he brought forth bread and wine; yet this was to *Abraham*, and not to God: or ſuppoſe what was brought forth to *Abraham* for the refreſhment of him and his followers, was firſt offered to God; yet it is not certain that he offered nothing elſe; he might offer ordinary Sacrifices of Beaſts as other Prieſts did: And from one place where *Moſes* occaſionally ſpeaks of *Melchiſedechs* bounty to *Abraham*, that he brought forth bread and wine; we cannot have any certain ground that *Melchiſedechs* ſacrifice was nothing but bread and wine. Either they muſt bring ſome place that affirms *Melchiſedech* only offered

fered bread and wine; or if he was a Prieſt of the moſt high God, 'tis more likely that he offered ſuch ſacrifices as other Prieſts did. Thus here is no certainty of the firſt ground of this Romiſh Doctrine; *Melchiſedechs* ſacrifice is not certainly known, therefore none can ſay certainly *Melchiſedceh* offered only bread and wine. 2. It is uncertain, that Chriſts *Melchiſedechian* Prieſthood conſiſted in the offering under theſe forms; for where Chriſt is ſaid to be a Prieſt after the order of *Melchiſedech*, there is nothing mentioned of the Sacrifice that he offered; here is nothing in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* (where is the only diſcourſe of Chriſts *Melchiſedechian* Prieſthood) concerning any ſacrifice under the form of bread and wine: And that he at his laſt Supper ſhould declare himſelf a Prieſt after the order of *Melchiſedech*, and ſhould offer at that time a ſacrifice proper to that Prieſthood (*i. e.*) himſelf under the form of bread and wine, is no way evident from any paſſage at the Supper, recorded by the Evangeliſts, or any diſcourſe of this order of

Melchiſedech by the Apoſtle *Paul*; and if it be not evident by the Hiſtory of the Supper, or any diſcourſe concerning the *Melchiſedechian* Prieſthood in the Scriptures, then it is uncertain that Chriſts *Melchiſedechian* Prieſthood conſiſted in offering his body under theſe forms. 2. It is not certain that Chriſt could not be a Prieſt for ever after this Order, unleſs he left ſucceſſors to offer the like ſacrifice. For, 1. He may be ſtiled a Prieſt for ever, in regard of the efficacy of his Prieſthood, though this Prieſt offer'd Sacrifice (*i. e.*) himſelf once upon the Croſs, yet the virtue of this laſts for ever: for he needed not daily or on a certain day, the day of Expiation every year, as the *Aaronical* High Prieſts, to offer ſacrifice, for this he did once, when he offered up himſelf; * nor did he need to offer himſelf often, for then he muſt have ſuffered often, but now once hath he appeared to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf *. Thus then he might be called a Prieſt for ever though he left no ſucceſſors, for ſo great was the worth of the Sacrifice which

* Heb. 7. 27.

* Heb. 9. 25, 26.

which this Prieſt once offered, that it laſts for ever. 2. He might be ſtiled a Prieſt for ever in reſpect of the execution of his Prieſtly Office, for his Office was not only to ſatisfie for ſin by his death, but to make interceſſion for ſinners, and it was as neceſſary that he ſhould appear in Heaven in the preſence of God for us, as to have ſuffered on the Croſs. If Chriſt ſhould have continued on earth, he had not been a Prieſt * (*i. e.*) had not performed the office of the Prieſt, both to die for us here, and preſent his ſufferings before his Father in Heaven. Since then he ever lives to make interceſſion for us, and muſt ſtill perform that office of the Prieſt, in interceeding with God for us, he may be called a Prieſt for ever in reſpect of the execution of his Prieſtly Office. 3. He may be ſaid to be a Prieſt for ever, becauſe this Prieſt lives for ever: and this is ſufficiently intimated from the Apoſtles diſcourſe, * where he oppoſes the *Aaronical* and *Melchiſedechian* Prieſts, the one was made after the Law of a carnal commandment (*i. e.*) the Law allowed

* Heb. 8. 4.

* Heb. 7. 16, 17, 23, 24.

a carnal ſucceſſion, becauſe thoſe Prieſts were mortal, but the other was made after the power of an endleſs life, for he neither ſucceeded any that went before him nor left any ſucceſſor after him. Again, in the *Aaronical* Prieſthood there were many Prieſts, becauſe they were not ſuffered to continue by reaſon of death; but this man (*i. e.*) Chriſt becauſe he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable Prieſthood. So that though he hath no ſucceſſor in his Office, yet he is a Prieſt for ever; and this will further appear from that deſcription of *Melchiſedech*, That he had neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a Prieſt continually *. The Apoſtle ſpeaks of *Melchiſedech* as if his Prieſthood were an eternal Prieſthood, and himſelf an eternal Prieſt. But how is that? Becauſe the Scripture never mentioning any ſucceſſors of *Melchiſedech* doth ſeem to repreſent him as one that never died, and therefore he muſt be an eternal Prieſt, ſuch a Prieſt as Chriſt was, that lives for ever. And therefore the

* Heb. 7. 3.

Order

Order of *Melchiſedech* is not to be interpreted from the manner of the Sacrifice, what kind of thing *Melchiſedech* offered; but from the continuance of the Prieſt: as the Type was without end of days; for there is no ſucceſſor of his recorded; ſo Chriſt the Antitype was really an eternal Prieſt, for he liveth for ever himſelf, and needeth no ſucceſſors. Thus Chriſt may be ſtiled a Prieſt for ever, (*Eſtius* * acknowledges ſo much,) *ratione perſonæ*, becauſe no man ſucceeds him in his Prieſthood, *ratione officii*, becauſe he always pleads for us in Heaven, and *ratione effectus*, becauſe by that ſacrifice which he offered he is made the Author of eternal Salvation to us. If now Chriſt is juſtly ſtiled a Prieſt for ever upon theſe grounds, then it's not certain that the eternity of Chriſts Prieſthood requires a ſucceſſor. Indeed ſome of them tell us, they do not mean that Chriſt hath properly ſucceſſors, for they are ſubſtituted into the room of him that is dead or abſent; but Chriſt hath not left his Prieſthood, therefore there is no need of ſucceſſors; and *Eſtius* ſaith, that

* *In cp. ad Heb. c. 7. v. 17.*

that no Catholick, (that ſpeaks adviſedly) will ſay ſo: yet they tell us that Chriſt muſt have ſome Vicars or Subſtitutes to ſacrifice in his ſtead, and that he could not be a Prieſt for ever unleſs he ſacrificed by his Miniſters, ſince he could not properly ſacrifice by himſelf. * But neither is this true, that Chriſt could not be a Prieſt for ever, unleſs he ſacrificed by his Miniſters. For, 1. This is founded on a falſe ground, that a Prieſt continues a Prieſt no longer than he ſacrifices, and therefore Chriſt could not be a Prieſt for ever, unleſs he had ſomething to ſacrifice; which is as much, as that a man ceaſes to have an office, when he ceaſes to execute that office; the abſurdity of which opinion is ſufficiently confuted in ſeveral inſtances, by a late learned * Author, whoſe particular induſtry about the Maſs might much have ſuperſeded my pains on this Subject, if this Diſcourſe had not been prepared for the Preſs before I ſaw his Book, and if I had not deſigned the handling of theſe things in another manner and method. 2. If they had conſidered

* *Bell. de miſſa l. 1. c. 25. f. quod tam.*

* Dr. *Brevint* of the depth of the Maſs. c. 11.

ſidered that there was a double duty required of this High Prieſt, not only the ſacrificing of himſelf here on earth, but the preſenting of this ſacrifice before his Father in Heaven, they would ſoon have obſerved the miſtake. For though he had finiſht that part which was to be done upon the Croſs, yet he had not finiſht that which remained to be done in Heaven, (*i.e.*) to plead the merit of his death and ſufferings before his Father, and to intercede for us within the vail; as it was with his Type the High Prieſt on the day of expiation; he was not only to ſacrifice without the vail, but to enter within the vail into the Holy of Holies, and there to ſprinkle the blood before the Mercy-Seat. Now though the ſacrifice was kill'd without, yet he is ſaid to offer this within the vail; juſt ſo it was with Chriſt, he was ſlain in the outer Court here on earth; but anſwerable to this Type he entred into the holy place, into Heaven, and there appears in the preſence of God for us, neither by the blood of Calves and Goats, but by his own blood he entred

in

in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us: * and he doth now inſtead of that blood of Goats and Calves preſent his own blood before his Father. Thus Chriſt doth not ceaſe from a Sacerdotal act, and therefore though he doth not now ſacrifice, yet he doth not ceaſe to be a Prieſt, no more than the High Prieſt when he was within the Vail, and was offering that blood before the Mercy-Seat. Thus 'tis not certain what the Romaniſts lay for a foundation, that Chriſt could not be a Prieſt for ever, unleſs he ſacrificed by his Miniſters. For he doth ſtill perform a Sacerdotal act appearing before God for us, and ſo *Eſtius* confeſſes upon *Heb.* 9. 25.

* Heb. 9. 12.

3. 'Tis not certain, that by thoſe words, *do this in remembrance of me*, he made the Apoſtles Prieſts, and gave them and their ſucceſſors power to offer his body and blood. For, 1. Here is no ground from the words that *do this* ſhould ſignifie offer this or that, *do this in remembrance of me* ſhould ſignifie, offer this ſacrifice; and whether is it

it more reaſonable to expound the words of a ſacrifice, of which there is in the foregoing words not the leaſt mention, or that they muſt be referred to the paſſage which went immediately before? That as Chriſt bleſſed, and brake, and gave, ſaying *take eat*, &c. ſo hereafter they ſhould do this in remembrance of him, do this, which he then did, and commanded them to do, in remembrance of his death and paſſion. 2. If theſe words made them Prieſts to offer up Chriſts body, then all the faithful are made Prieſts, for he ſaith to all, *take, eat, this do in remembrance of me*: And it's plain as *Eſtius* acknowledgeth on 1 *Cor.* 11. 24. that St. *Paul* refers thoſe words to the whole Church of *Corinth*, to whom he writes; for after he had related the inſtitution, that Chriſt ſaid, *take, eat, this is my body which is broken for you, do this in remembrance of me*, and again, *this cup is the New Teſtament in my blood, this do as oft as ye ſhall drink it in remembrance of me*, he explains theſe words in the following verſe, *for as oft as ye eat this bread*

and

and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the Lords death, which would not be a convenient explaining of those words, if they did not refer to all the Disciples, but only to the Priests. 'Tis true, the Romanists would fain expound the words that the Priests must do something which Christ did (*i. e.*) sacrifice his body, as well as the people perform these actions of taking, and eating; but still here is no certainty that *do this*, must refer to something which it is not said there that Christ did, or required others to do; still I say here's no certainty that Christ did bid them sacrifice as Priests, as he had sacrificed in his last Supper, for here is nothing of any sacrifice in his last Supper, here are no words in the History of his last Supper which signifie any such thing, here is nothing to be found when he instituted this both for a Sacrifice and for a Sacrament, by what words he particularly appointed the Apostles Priests to offer a sacrifice, different from the institution of the Sacrament, wherein they are commanded to take and eat in remembrance of him. Thus here are

many

many things uncertain and doubtful; we can neither find any inſtitution in theſe words of a proper Prieſt to ſacrifice, nor any ſubſtitution in Chriſts room to offer ſacrifice. And if there be no certainty of this, then there is no certainty of any true proper ſacrifice in the Euchariſt. When they have conſidered all this, they will ſee that this Doctrine is ſo full of perplexities and uncertainties, that it is unreaſonable to make it an article of faith, without which there is no Salvation.

2. They enjoyn us to profeſs, that there is a propitiatory ſacrifice in the Maſs for the living and the dead. And truly they are much concerned in the maintenance of this Doctrine; for the people being perſwaded that there is a propitiatory ſacrifice in the Maſs for the living and the dead, that the Prieſt may apply this ſacrifice to whom he pleaſes, and the more Maſſes are ſaid for them, the greater benefit they obtain; the people therefore were willingly perſwaded to hire the Prieſts to ſay Maſſes for them, ſome founded Chauntry Prieſts

to

to ſay a Maſs perpetually for their ſouls, others left great Legacies for hundreds or thouſands of Maſſes: one Cardinal appointed fifty thouſand Maſſes to be ſaid for his ſoul; and there are few ſo forgetful of the Prieſts profit or themſelves, who do not leave the Prieſt ſomething for a Maſs for them. And the Maſs being now conſidered as a propitiatory ſacrifice offered by the Prieſt, it mattered not whether any were preſent or no, (and ſo private Maſſes ſtole into the Church,) for the Prieſt offered the Sacrifice, as Chriſts ſubſtitute, and whether any were preſent or no, yet the Sacrifice would have its proper effect. Thus this Doctrine is of high advantage in the Romiſh Church, but yet really it is wholly uncertain and doubtful: for this ſacrifice of the Maſs was inſtituted by Chriſt (ſay they) at his laſt Supper, and either Chriſt offered a propitiatory Sacrifice at his laſt Supper or no; if he did not, then there is no propitiatory Sacrifice now offered; if he did, then Chriſt in his laſt Supper redeemed the world, and therefore there was no need of the Sacri-

crifice on the Croſs. If it be a properly propitiatory ſacrifice, then it properly appeaſes Gods wrath, ſatisfies Gods juſtice, and by conſequence takes away the neceſſity of Chriſts death; for if the end is fulfilled for which he died, then there is no neceſſity of his death. If it be propitiatory in the ſame manner that the ſacrifice of the Croſs is, why then doth it not work the ſame effect? And if it were not propitiatory in the ſame manner, but only as repreſenting the future ſufferings of Chriſt, then how is it properly propitiatory? He that thinks to ſatisfie himſelf by calling it a repreſentative commemorative ſacrifice, muſt conſider both how he makes it a true ſacrifice, and how he makes it a proper propitiatory ſacrifice; for to make it a repreſentative ſacrifice there was no need that Chriſt himſelf ſhould be ſacrificed, no more than it was neceſſary that Chriſt himſelf ſhould be ſacrificed really in the old ſacrifices, which were the repreſentations of that ſacrifice which ſhould be offered on the Croſs. There may be a repreſentation of Chriſts ſufferings, with-

out Christ himself being sacrificed. And also this sacrifice of Christ in the Supper, which is wholly invisible, cannot be a representation of that which is visible; for usually we take things that are seen to represent those things that are not seen; but I know no reason why men should take that which is not seen to represent those things which shall be seen. So that now to call it a representative sacrifice, and yet a true sacrifice, is wholly unintelligible. Again, to make this sacrifice in the Supper representative and yet properly propitiatory, is as hard to be imagined: For we cannot understand how the representation of a propitiatory sacrifice (*i.e.*) of that on the Cross, can work the same effect with the thing it self, unless the representation in a glass of a man paying a sum of money can work the same effect and discharge a debt, as well as the actual laying down the sum. They require us to profess that there is a propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass, yet when it comes to be inquired into, here's only a commemoration and representation of that sacrifice

which

which is propitiatory. But now the repreſentation of the ſacrifice is not the ſame thing with the ſacrifice, no more than the Image or Picture of the man is the ſame thing with the man himſelf. They require us to profeſs that Chriſts blood here is really ſhed for remiſſion of ſins, and on this ground they prove it to be a propitiatory ſacrifice; yet they will not ſay here's any ſatisfying Gods wrath, or paying a price for the ſins of men. They tell us we muſt profeſs it is propitiatory, but after that they have tired themſelves long about the meaning of this propitiatory, they conclude 'tis applicatory, (*i. e.*) a ſacrifice applying the propitiation of Chriſt: but then 'tis uncertain that there needs a ſacrifice propitiatory to apply a ſacrifice propitiatory. If by the ſacrifice on the Croſs he hath ſatisfied Gods juſtice, and merited remiſſion of ſin, then 'tis uncertain that there needs any more ſacrifice for ſin; or what reaſon can there be that there muſt be a propitiatory ſacrifice to apply the benefits purchaſed by the propitiatory ſacrifice on the Croſs? If there was

an univerſal ſatisfaction made by Chriſts Saerifice on the Croſs, then what need a ſatisfaction to apply that ſatisfaction? or of a new propitiatory Sacrifice to apply the death of Chriſt to any particular perſon? Or when the full ſumm that we owed to God is already payed upon the Croſs, that yet we our ſelves or the Prieſt for us ſhould tender any ſumm to God to apply that general payment to us, or to intereſt us in it? Certainly it cannot be reaſonable that the Surety ſhould pay the debt twice, or that he muſt pay again the ſame ſumm to the Creditor, that the perſon for whom he payed it may receive benefit by the firſt payment. Further, I would fain underſtand how the ſacrifice of the Maſs is truly propitiatory, or how God appeaſed by this offering giving repentance forgives ſins, as the Council ſayes, * for here is more than applying the ſacrifice of the Croſs, here is procuring the ſame things, and making the ſacrifice of the Maſs of equal value with the ſacrifice of the Croſs. Well; but ſuppoſe they mean only that it applies the ſacrifice of

* Seſſ. 22. c. 2.

the

the Croſs, but then ſtill 'tis unintelligible how that which applyes the ſacrifice of the Croſs is the ſame thing with that which is applyed. They will have the ſame ſacrifice, for there is the ſame Hoſt, and the ſame principal Offerer: now how the ſacrifice of the Maſs can apply the ſacrifice of the Croſs, and yet be the ſame, this is uncertain. Well, but ſuppoſe it were applicatory, yet what reall value it is of, or how much it can procure, ſtill they are uncertain; If it does not procure ſome thing infallibly, then all their money is loſt, and the frequent uſe of private Maſſes ſpoyled. By no means muſt they ſay that this ſacrifice is not of a great value; for that were to decry their own ware, and leſſen the Prieſts profit: If there be the ſame Hoſt and the ſame principal Prieſt, then the offering muſt be of great value; but whether infinite or finite, that troubles them. If the value be infinite, then one Maſs will do the work, as well as one oblation upon the Croſs: apply the Maſs by your intention, and what need have any to procure more Maſſes? If a peny will

do, what need men lay out a pound? But now here lies the myſtery, they dare not ſay it is infinite, for then it renders after-Maſſes ſuperfluous, and leſſens the Prieſts trade: * well, but then it muſt be finite, but yet by their principles that is uncertain, for the value of the ſacrifice muſt be from the dignity of the principal Prieſt offering; if then Chriſt here Offers his own body, then how can the value be finite? If the ſacrifice on the Croſs, and in the Maſs differ only *ratione*, then really they are the ſame, and why then ſhould the value of the one be infinite, and the value of the other finite? The uſual pretence which the Romaniſts have, why they ſay the value of the one is infinite, and of the other finite, is this, becauſe in the ſacrifice on the Croſs, the Son of God offers by himſelf, and in the ſacrifice of the Maſs he Offers by his Miniſter; and there is a great deal of difference betwixt the action of the Son of God done by himſelf, and that which is done by his Miniſters: * but now this ſeems ſtrange to me, who alwayes think, the alms is the ſame whether

* *Bell. de Miſſa l. 2. c. 4. ſect. quarta.*

* *Bell de Miſſa l. 2. c. 4. ſect. Secunda ratio.*

whether one give it by himſelf, or by his ſervant, whether he give it with his own hand, or give it to his ſervant to carry to the poor. Beſides, according to this Doctrine, then the ſacrifice in the Supper muſt be of infinite value, for there Chriſt offer'd by himſelf. And then that ſacrifice muſt infinitely apply, as well as the ſacrifice on the Croſs infinitely redeem: and as there is no reaſon for any other ſacrifice on the Croſs, becauſe by that one oblation he hath finiſht our redemption, becauſe that ſacrifice was of infinite worth to ſatisfie Gods juſtice; ſo there would be no reaſon for any Maſſes to apply Chriſts ſacrifice, becauſe that ſacrifice in the Supper which Chriſt offered by himſelf was of infinite worth to apply that ſacrifice, which ſhould be offered on the Croſs: Thus here's nothing but perplexity and uncertainty in all this Doctrine: And indeed it can be no otherwiſe, when men will be wiſe above what is written, and aſſert ſuch things for the high myſteries of Religion, which are not clearly revealed by God. They tell us this ſacrifice is propitiatory, but

will they ſtick there? No, for ſometimes they ſay it is propitiatory, and ſometimes again impetratory: the proper efficiency is by way of impetration ſayes *Bellarmin* * (*i. e.*) by way of ſupplication and prayers; but if ſo, then the Sacrifice of the Maſs can only procure and impetrate good according to the devotion of the Prieſt, for prayers of themſelves cannot procure any thing from God, but only according to the piety and fervency of him that prayes: otherwiſe they muſt acknowledge that God is pleaſed with bare repeating of words without affection, which is plainly to turn Prayers into Charms. But now if the ſacrifice of the Maſs do no more, then the people give much to little purpoſe, and throw away their money for that which may be very little worth, for they know not whether the Prieſt be good or bad, whether he Offers this ſacrifice with devotion or without devotion; and if he be bad, his ſacrifice is not accepted, and he procures nothing for them: well, therefore they have another way, and this *Bellarmin* * ſayes, is the common opinion of Divines,

* *De Miſſa l. 2. c. 4.*

* *Ibi l. 2. c. 4.*

Divines, (*i. e.*) that the ſacrifice procures ſomething *ex opere operato*: for ſince there is the ſame hoſt and the ſame offerer here, which was in the ſacrifice of the Croſs, let the immediate Miniſter be what he will, ſtill it will work its effect; and the principal effect of this ſacrifice does not depend on the goodneſs of the immediate Miniſter: and the effect, ſayes *Becanus*, is *ex opere operato* infallibly, for it is founded in an abſolute promiſe in reſpect of him who doth not *ponere obicem*, (*i. e.*) ſo that he doth not hinder the effect of the ſacrifice. And ſayes he, where the ſacrifice is applyed to any or offered for any, without the ſpecial determination of the offerer, then it work *ex opere operato*. But now here I am puzled again, if they have ſuch a propitiatory or impetratory ſacrifice that can work *ex opere operato* where the perſon for whom it's offered doth not *ponere obicem*, why then are not the ſouls in Purgatory delivered thence? What needs ſo many Maſſes to be ſaid for them? me thinks this ſhould ſave the Prieſt much of his labour, and the

Sum. Schol. Theol. cap. 25. q. 2.

the people much of their money; if this ſacrifice be Propitiatory for the dead and that *ex Opere Operato*, then ſurely one Maſs ſhould help them out of Purgatory. And there can be no reaſon why a man ſhould be put to procure ſo many when far leſs will do? If the ſouls in Purgatory can put no bar to the efficacy of this Sacrifice, 'tis ſtrange that Purgatory is not long ſince emptied. If the Prieſt hath offered this Sacrifice for the dead, and the effect doth follow infallibly, where the perſon for whom it is offered doth put no impediment, and we cannot ſee how the ſouls in Purgatory can put any impediment; then what ſhould keep any there? It would be unreaſonable to keep the Priſoner, when the debt is payd, or require the tender of ſatisfaction for them every day, when the whole hath been payed before; thus here's nothing but uncertainties. As for the living, they tell us, if it be offered for ſinners, though it doth not immediately forgive ſins, yet by this Sacrifice is procured the gift of repentance; but then are there not ſinners that have

many Maſſes ſaid for them, who yet have not this gift of repentance given them? It would be an happy turn if all ſhould have this grace given them, who have Maſſes ſaid for them, nay it would be ſtrange if any ſhould miſs of this grace, if they might have it ſo eaſily: they have therefore another fetch, the Sacrifice of the Maſs (ſays *Bellarmin* *) when it is offered for ſinners, procures a new & certain help whereby ſinners may be brought to repentance: but this help hath a divers operation according to the divers diſpoſition of men; for if he be diſpoſed to contrition, then it works contrition, if he be not diſpoſed, it works a new diſpoſition: but if every Maſs work a new diſpoſition, how can it be imagined that contrition ſhould not be wrought in the end? and the perſon at length be Converted? I cannot ſee how any perſon can remain unconverted, if the Romiſh Prieſts really deſire their Converſion; for if every Maſs add ſome new diſpoſition, and the more Maſſes the more diſpoſitions wrought; I would fain ſee why they may not at length come

* *l.* 2. *c.* 5. *de Miſſâ.*

to

to that next diſpoſition to Converſion, and then one Maſs more and they will be effectually Converted. If there be a certain increaſe of diſpoſitions by the Maſſes for them, then unleſs either they are too ſparing in procuring, or the Prieſts too backward in ſaying Maſs, how could any remain unconverted? They tell us without doubt theſe Maſſes do help theſe perſons, but wherein this help lyes, and what it does effect is uncertain, and doubtful. They tell us that the Maſs is a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and dead, and this we muſt profeſs, or elſe we are Hereticks: But me thinks 'tis but reaſonable we ſhould firſt underſtand, how they can benefit the living and the dead, before we be bound to profeſs it. If they could really convince us that there is any ſuch benefit procured by thoſe Maſſes, we ſhould not ſo much queſtion how the benefit is procured, or which way they help us; if we could be really ſenſible of any help by a certain Medicine, we ſhould not trouble our ſelves which way the Phyſick wrought: but we are loth to pay for

that Phyſick which we do not underſtand can do any good, or be tyed to uſe that Phyſick, which though ſome may fancy help by it, yet we can really find none. Or laſtly, to profeſs that this is a moſt excellent uſeful receipt and does good both to the living and dead, when yet we cannot by any obſervation find it is ſo. They tell us, that Maſſes are rightly offered for ſins and for puniſhments; but of what great uſe they are about ſins, or for what kind of ſins they are helpful, that's very uncertain. The Council ſayes it ſerves to procure the pardon of mortal ſins. So ſay many others, that it is Propitiatory not only for ſmall but for great faults, even for mortal ſins. * But yet ſtill 'tis uncertain, for they will not ſay that the Sacrifice of the Maſs merits the pardon of thoſe ſins; they will not ſay it does infallibly procure the pardon of thoſe ſins for whom it is offered; they will not ſay it infallibly procures the grace of repentance; they are not certain what that new and certain help is, which they ſay it procures: And ſome ſeeing theſe difficulties

* *Seſſ. 6. cap. 2. Biel in Can. Miſſ. l. 61. 85. ff. Bell. de miſſ. l. 2. c. 1.*

culties affirm it only ſerves to take away venial ſins, and that there is no certain effect which is procured by that ſacrifice *ex opere operato*, but meerly the pardon of ſome ſlight venial ſins, which are as well done by ſprinkling a little holy water, or by the uſe of their Sacramentals as they call them.

They tell us this Sacrifice is rightly offered for whatſoever neceſſities, and there are ſome peculiar Maſſes which we are told are ſo uſeful that they work ſtrange effects; I meet with one, and that is a Soveraign remedy againſt the Plague, it is ſtiled *de mortalitate evitandâ* *, and thoſe that heard it, were to hold a burning candle in their hand during the whole Maſs, and to kneel, and then they ſhould not dye ſuddenly; and if one fear this is too good news to be true, the Rubrick gives you a *probatum eſt*, that theſe cures were wrought at *Avignon* and the parts thereabouts: there being a great mortality in thoſe parts and many dying ſuddenly. *John* 22. compoſed this Maſs, for an infallible remedy. But I would ſtill underſtand how I may be aſſured this is

* *Miſſal. Sarum. fol.* 110.

an

an infallible remedy, for why that Maſs more than another Maſs, or why the Maſs of St. *Sebaſtian* or St. *Roche* more than another Maſs; or indeed why any Maſs ſhould have this infallible effect? Though they tell us of theſe great matters it procures, as he that would have others buy his commodities uſually commends them, but how or which way the Sacrifice of the Maſs can procure theſe things, more than the Prayers ſaid by the Prieſt, they are much perplexed. How far this ſacrifice of the Maſs works *ex opere operato*, how far *ex opere operantis*, how far *ex opere operantis Chriſti*, how far *ex opere operantis miniſtri ſecundarii*, and yet ſtill how far *ex opere operato* meerly by the virtue of the inſtitution it ſelf, without reſpect to the merit of the offerer, how far it works *per modum impetrationis*, infallibly, and how far not, they are much perplexed: and theſe unintelligible diſtinctions they uſe to explain their minds, ſpeak the greater uncertainty and perplexity. * The Council promiſes great matters, that God appeaſed by this ſacrifice does give repentance, forgive ſins;

* *Fill. ac. Caſ. Conſc. tr. 5. c. Bell. de Miſſa. l. 2. c. 4.*

and

and that it ought to be offered for ſins, puniſhments and neceſſities, for the living or dead; but how or which way we ſhall receive any advantage by this ſacrifice, or what real effect certainly it will produce, or whether it does work ſuch effects as the Council ſays, themſelves are much puzled to explain; and when they have done all they can, the doctrine ſtill remains doubtful and uncertain, and therefore we cannot be bound to profeſs it. There is no certainty of any inſtitution of a proper ſacrifice: Nothing concerning it certain from Scipture; and ſo *George Ataida* a Portugal Divine in the Council of *Trent* ſtifly maintained, that the Maſs could not be ſaid to be a ſacrifice, but by the ground of tradition, and he examined one after another the places of the New Teſtament alledged by the Divines, ſhewing, that no expreſs ſignification of the ſacrifice could be drawn from them: * No certainty that our Saviour did offer in his laſt Supper; for thoſe words on which they inſiſt, *This is my Body which is broken for you*, cannot refer to any Sacrifice of Chriſts Body there; for the breaking

* Hiſt. of the Counc. of *Trent*, *lib. 6.*

ing here was before the Conſecrations and that meerly of Bread, and at that time when he ſpoke thoſe words, there was no actual breaking of the Body at all. Here's no certainty that the true proper conditions of a true proper ſacrifice are here found, for here is no certainty of a ſenſible thing offered in this ſacrifice, no certainty in what the action of ſacrificing properly conſiſts, nor any certainty of the inſtitution of any Prieſts to offer this Sacrifice: here are nothing but unintelligible difficulties, ridles upon ridles; a viſible ſacrifice of an inviſible thing, a ſacrificing of bread and no bread, of Chriſts Body and not of Chriſts Body, a deſtruction of a thing which is the production of it, a breaking of Chriſts Body and yet the Body whole, a ſhedding of Chriſts blood and yet none iſſues out of the veins, an outward ſacrifice really ſacrificed, and yet all to be believed, and nothing to be perceived by the ſenſes; theſe uncertainties and doubts we muſt ſwallow, ere we can believe this article. And yet further 'tis uncertain that there is any tradition of a true proper ſacrifice in the Maſs, for many contented them-

ſelves with calling it a ſacrifice, without further enquiry whether it was a proper or figurative ſacrifice: Many call'd it a ſacrifice as it was the repreſentation of the true Sacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs; as we call the Images by the names of the things which they repreſent; and this they cannot deny was one reaſon why it is ſo called; *celebratio hujus ſacrificii Imago quædam eſt paſſionis Chriſti repræſentativa; quæ eſt vera ejus immolatio, ideo & ipſa immolatio nominatur*, ſays *Biel**. In the time of the ancient Schoolmen they gave this as the reaſon why they called it ſo; *Lombard* asks the queſtion whether what was done by the Prieſt be properly called a ſacrifice, and whether Chriſt be daily offered, or once only? and the anſwer in ſhort he gave was this *, that which is Offered, and Conſecrated by the Prieſt, is the remembrance and repreſentation of the true ſacrifice, and of that holy Oblation on the Altar of the Croſs: and he is daily ſacrificed in the Sacrament, becauſe in the Sacrament there is a commemoration of what was once done. If then that was the reaſon why

* *Lect. in Can. Miſſ. lect. 85. ff.*

* *Lib. 4. diſt. 12.*

why they call'd it a ſacrifice, then there is no certainty of any tradition of a true proper ſacrifice in the Maſs. Indeed *Bellarmin* to ſolve this doubt interprets this queſtion of *Peter Lombard*'s concerning killing, as if he had askt whether that which the Prieſt doth, can be call'd a killing of Chriſt, and then that he anſwered moſt rightly, that Chriſt was only once truly immolated or ſacrificed (*i.e.*) ſlain, but now that he is not properly ſacrificed, (that is) ſlain, but only in a Sacrament or repreſentation; and he adds that it could not be the queſtion whether it be a proper ſacrifice though unbloody, for he ſuppoſed that, as well known to all men, from the daily celebration of that ſacrifice. But this is a plain evaſion, to ſay that this was well known, which the queſtion here implies was not well known, for the words are, whether that which the Prieſt does, can be properly call'd a ſacrifice; that is, whether Chriſt is really in the Supper offered to God for a Sacrifice? and he anſwers Chriſt is offered there, not truly and properly but commemoratively and repreſentatively. If then it was

ſo well known, that there was a true, proper ſacrifice, it ſeems ſtrange that he ſhould ſay it was not a proper ſacrifice, but only the remembrance of a true Sacrifice; and therefore we have reaſon to judge from this plain anſwer that there was no ſuch proper ſacrifice then maintained in the Church. If then that was the reaſon which *Lombard* gives why they call'd it a Sacrifice, then there is no certainty of a true proper ſacrifice in the Maſs. Again, here is no certainty, that this ſacrifice is a propitiatory ſacrifice in the ſence of the Council: or if it may be call'd in a large ſence a propitiatory ſacrifice, that yet it is a true proper propitiatory ſacrifice, themſelves cannot agree in what ſence 'tis properly propitiatory; and many of their explications will not agree with the determination of the Council, or the common practice of their Church. There is no certainty that it was inſtituted to be a propitiatory ſacrifice, for they are not agreed whether the words of Inſtitution, *this is the blood of the New Teſtament which is ſhed for you, and for many for remiſſion of ſins*, be underſtood

derſtood of the myſtical effuſion in the Supper or the bloody effuſion on the Croſs? *Filliucius* * underſtands them of the bloody effuſion; and ſo both the vulgar tranſlation and the Roman Miſſal read thoſe words in the future, as referring this effuſion to that which ſhall be on the Croſs. But then where's the inſtitution of a propitiatory ſacrifice? And they all grant that there muſt be an inſtitution, or elſe 'tis unreaſonable to pretend ſuch an effect. On the other hand many underſtand them of the myſtical effuſion, ſo * *Bellarmin*, the * Rhemiſh Tranſlators and * *Becanus*, *&c.* Here is no certainty that Chriſt did offer a propitiatory ſacrifice in the laſt Supper, and this the Biſhop of *Velia* in the Council of *Trent* maintained with very forcible reaſons; and the Author of the Hiſtory ſays, that the Biſhop perſwaded ſo many, that it was almoſt the common opinion not to make mention of the propitiatory ſacrifice offered by Chriſt in the Supper; and if no certainty that there was any propitiatory ſacrifice there, then no certainty that there is any propitiatory ſacrifice here. There is no certainty of

* *Ca. Coſ. tract. 5. c. 3. n. 59.*

* *l. 2. de miſſa c. 2.* § *ſecundum.*
* *Rhem. Teſtam. on* Luk. 22. 20. *&* Mat. 26. 28. * *Sum. Schol. Theol. c. 25. q. 11.*

the value of this ſacrifice, no certainty of the true proper efficiency of it, no certainty that the Prieſt has this power to apply the fruit of this ſacrifice to whom he will, no certainty that he can determine the virtue of this ſacrifice to whom he pleaſes; for apply it (to whom he will) in his own intention, yet there is no certainty that really the perſon ſhall receive any benefit by that application, unleſs his intention here be conformable to the Divine will; and here is no certainty that it is according to Gods will, except it be miraculouſly revealed what is Gods will. No man can aſſign particularly to one, that which is properly anothers to give; and if he do aſſign it, unleſs the perſon confirm the aſſignment, he may yet go without it. Till then we can be aſſured, that the Prieſt applys the virtue or fruit of the ſacrifice to them, for whom God intends it, we may be never a peny better by all the Maſſes that the Prieſt ſays for us. Thus here's nothing but uncertainties, and it cannot be otherwiſe, when doctrines are not founded on Divine Revelation, but humane fancies. Should a

man

man enquire into their ſeveral diſcourſes about applying the fruit of this ſacrifice, he would find nothing but confuſion and uncertaintie. They all grant that ſome part of the fruit of this ſacrifice muſt be in his power, or elſe all this diſcourſe of applying the fruit of this ſacrifice is needleſs. But the queſtion is What part of the fruit is in his power? whether there be a part due to him as a publick Miniſter, or whether a part be due to him as a private perſon? whether he applyes the fruit as due to him as a publick perſon, or as a private? for ſome think he applyes only that which is due to him as a publick perſon, others think that which is due to him as a private perſon: and ſome ſay * a Prieſt may have three parts, as an Offerer, as an Orthodox perſon, and as a Procurer of the Maſs, that is, when he ſays Maſs for nothing; but if one ſhould ask, how they will diſtinguiſh theſe parts? how much is due upon one account, how much upon another, or what aſſurance they have, that there is really ſuch a diviſion of the fruits of this ſacrifice as they tells us? the wiſeſt

* *Navar. Enchirid. c. 25. n. 3.*

of them all could not tell what to answer. Suppose the Priest says a Mass for wages, what fruit can he apply to the person for whom he says the Mass? if he saves any part for himself, then it is doubtful whether he do not wrong the person for whom he offered; and therefore some of them think it best particularly to assign that portion to those for whom they offer, though they cannot tell what it is; but others question whether a man is not bound first to apply it to himself (for charity begins at home) before he apply it to others: but then when he has applyed any part of the fruit of the Mass to himself, what certainty that there is any part remaining which he can dispose to others? Some distinguish of an application *specialissimè* to the Priest, *generalissimè* to the whole Church, and *specialitèr* to the person for whom the Mass is said*; but when he applys it most specially to himself, and most generally to the whole Church; whether is there any thing left to be applyed specially to the person for whom he offers? Again, that fruit which does apply, doth arise either

* *Biel. lect. in can Miss. lect. 26. L.*

ex

ex opere operato, or *ex opere operantis*; but how can he beſtow that which is *ex opere operato*, for that is due to the Church in general? and if he applyes only that which is due *ex opere operantis*; that is, what is due to him as a private perſon according to his own faith and devotion in the performance of his office, then an evil Prieſt could not benefit others by his Maſſes, and he that can apply nothing of this to himſelf can much leſs apply it to others: and he that will receive any benefit by a Maſs, muſt be ſure he get a good Prieſt to ſay it. Thus here is great uncertainty even in that which is the daily employment of the Romiſh Prieſts; ſo much uncertainty that they can never ſatisfie themſelves about this applying the fruit of this ſacrifice. They tell us there is a portion of this fruit due to the Church in general, to all that are expreſly named by the Prieſt in the Maſs, to all that procure the Prieſt to ſay Maſs, to all for whom he ſays Maſs and to himſelf. But then what this proportion is they confeſs God only knows; * whether the fruit be

* *Navarr. Enchir. c. 25. n. 3.*

be equally divided amongſt them, or to ſome more, ſome leſs? that's a great queſtion: *Navarr* thinks that God beſtows a certain part to every Orthodox perſon, which neither is increaſed becauſe they are fewer, nor decreaſed becauſe they are many, and a certain proportion to thoſe that are preſent at Maſs, a certain portion to thoſe who are ſpecially named in the Maſs, but then the portion for the Prieſt, and them that are named by him of his own accord, is greater or leſs according to the number of thoſe that he intends it for: but what certainty that one part is certain or the other uncertain? that the one part is always the ſame, and that the other riſes and falls? that the Church could ſettle this diviſion of the fruits of the Maſs, and that ſhe could aſſign ſuch a part to ſuch and ſuch uſes; and leave another part to the Prieſt to be diſpoſed as he pleaſes? and that this part which is in the Prieſts diſpoſal is that which a man deſires, when he would have Maſs ſaid for him? as *Azorius* informs us*: what aſſurance that if he does

* *Inſt. Mor. l. 10. c 20.*

does apply it generally to the whole Church, there be any thing left to apply ſpecially? or whether it be not as much profit as if he applyed it ſpecially? for the general portion which belongs to the Church is almoſt infinite, ſay *Gavantius**, whether if he offers ſpecially for ſeveral perſons, there be ſeveral degrees in this application of the Sacrifice? and to ſome he may apply it ſpecially in the firſt degree, to ſome in the ſecond, to ſome in the third? as *Biel* ſays *; or which way can a Prieſt ſatisfie the ſeveral obligations which are upon him to ſay a Maſs for ſeveral perſons? for perhaps he may apply ſuch a part of the fruit to one, which is due to another, as he may apply to *Peter*, that which is due to *Paul*; and yet as *Filliucius* * reſolves this caſe; *Peter* ſhall have the Benefit, although the Prieſt did wrongfully apply it: perhaps he may apply a greater part to one, than he ought: perhaps he may prefer thoſe in applying the Sacrifice to them, to whom he is not ſo much bound as he is to others: laſtly, perhaps he may have ſo many obligations, that he may

* *Theſ. ſacr. rit. part. 2. tit. 3 p.*

* *Sect 26 in can. Miſſ. 2.*

* *Caſ Conſc. tract. 5. c. 3. n. 76.*

may not know how to pay all which he ought to pay: and that part which is in the Priests power to dispose, may not serve to discharge all these debts: here are great scruples, and 'tis hard to advise what course to take, whether to make a general application, and beseech God to accept his oblation for those for whom God knows he is bound to offer, and in that degree God knows he is bound; or to make this special application by name to every person for whom he is bound to say Mass: which for several good causes and considerations * *Biel* thinks ought not to be omitted. But yet to avoid those scruples which trouble many about this special application of the sacrifice, there is a wholesome advice which *Biel* gives us out of *John Gerson*, and that is to put all thy spiritual goods into Gods hands, and do as men that know not how to pay their debts, they give all their estate up for their creditors, and leave only a maintenance for themselves as the Judge shall think fit. When thou hast confessed what thou owest to this or that person and so on, then desire God to distribute thy

* *Lect. 26. in Can. Miss.*

thy estate among thy Creditors. *Nolo calculum ponere cum amicis & benefactoribus meis, tu pro parte tuâ recipias Missam, tu orationem, tu bonum opus, tu sapientissime meritorum & suffragiorum ponderator deus distribue singulis*, &c. I will not reckon with my friends and benefactors, but do thou for thy part take a Mass, thou a Prayer, and thou a Good work, and thou O wise God that can value the merits and prayers of men, distribute to every one as they have need for their profit and my discharge. Thus they are loth to leave a debt unpaid, but are exceeding careful to assign to their Creditors, these Debenturs which are due from God Almighty, and apply their Masses and Prayers to their friends. But yet when all is seriously weigh'd, here's nothing but endless scruples, and infinite perplexities and uncertainties about this doctrine; nor can it be otherwise, where the doctrine is not found in the Scripture, nor owned in the primitive times, nor ever heard of till ignorance and covetousness prevailed in the Church. Thus I have handled my second Consideration.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

I Draw a third conſideration from the irreconcileableneſs of their Doctrine and practices, with the Prayers yet retained in their Offices; I inſtanced in the Doctrine about private Maſſes, Purgatory and Prayer for the dead, to which I now add the Article about communicating under one kind. The Council of *Conſtance* * acknowledged that Chriſt did inſtitute and give the Sacrament after Supper in both kinds, and the ſame is confeſſed by the Council of *Trent*, * that Chriſt did inſtitute this Sacrament in the laſt Supper under both kinds, and alſo delivered it to his Apoſtles, and that in the Primitive times it was not unuſual to communicate under both kinds; * but yet the Romiſh party have taken up this cuſtom of giving only the Bread: and becauſe it might ſeem ſtrange that the practice of the preſent Church ſhould ſo much deviate from the inſtitution of Chriſt, and the frequent

* *Seſſ.* 13.

* *Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 1.

* *Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 2.

frequent practice of the Ancients, they have therefore now decreed that it is in the power of the Church (saving the substance of the Sacrament) to alter what she sees most expedient for the profit of the receivers, or the veneration of the Sacrament. And they tell us, that though Christ hath instituted and delivered the Sacrament in both kinds, yet that all the faithful are not bound to * receive both kinds: and though from the beginning of Christianity the use of both kinds hath not been unusual, yet the custom by little and little being changed, the Church being moved by just reason hath approved this custom of communicating in one kind: * and they do Anathematize any person, that affirms that the Church hath not had just reasons to communicate with the Bread only the Laity, and Clergy who do not say Mass. * This is their Doctrine, but it is both uncertain, and inconsistent with their own prayers. 1. It is uncertain, For, 1. It is not certain that the faithful are not bound to receive according to Christs institution; for the Sacraments being

* *Sess.* 21. *c.* 1.

* *Sess.* 21. *c.* 2.

* *Sess.* 21. *can.* 2.

being not natural, but arbitrary ſigns, they owe their birth and original wholly to the inſtitution: according therefore as Chriſt hath inſtituted them, they ought to be received; if therefore Chriſt hath inſtituted in both kinds, then the Sacrament ought to be received in both kinds. 2. It is not certain that there is not as much a command to drink the Wine as to eat the Bread, for the words are preceptive, drink ye as well as eat ye, *yea drink ye all of this*, he that ordained the one, ordained the other in like words, and in like circumſtances, and there is nothing from the words of our Saviour which imply a command for eating, more than drinking. 3. Is there any command at all for the Laity to receive the Sacrament? if there be not, then it is free to receive it or not receive it, and if a man ſhould never receive it all his life, yet he ſhould not ſin againſt any Divine Law; if there be a command, then how doth it appear, that the Laity and Clergy who do not celebrate are left free to receive in one kind, or both? For either the command was given

given to the Apoſtles barely; and then none ſhould be bound to receive the Sacrament except the Apoſtles themſelves; or to the Apoſtles as Prieſts, and if ſo, then the Cup is due to all Prieſts whether they celebrate or no, and the Church could have no juſt cauſe to reſtrain the Clergy, when they do not celebrate, from the uſe of the Cup; for when the Sacrament was inſtituted in both kinds, the Apoſtles were not then Celebrators but Receivers, and therefore if they received as Prieſts, then Prieſts not celebrating have a right to the Cup. If the Apoſtles did repreſent all the faithful, then they all have a right to receive what their repreſenters did receive. Here is but one inſtitution, and how doth it appear that by the ſame inſtitution the Prieſts who do ſay Maſs are bound to receive in both kinds, and thoſe who do not ſay Maſs at that time in one kind? Either the inſtitution muſt oblige all alike or none, and either they muſt ſay that the faithful are bound to receive as the Apoſtles here did, or they may ſay that there is no obligation on them to receive in one

kind or both. 4. It is not certain that the Church hath any power to alter the manner of receiving, for the Priests are servants and not Lords, and are bound as Stewards to dispense their Lords Goods according to his will and not their own pleasure; where the Lord hath left things at liberty to their disposal, there they may alter and vary, but where there is any Divine Institution and appointment they are bound up by it. So that I can see no reason why under pretence of being the Ministers of Christ, and Stewards of the Mysteries of God, that they can oblige the people to receive in one kind, when Christ hath instituted, and the Apostles first received in both kinds. 5. It is not certain that the Church hath been moved by just causes and reasons to forbid communicating in both kinds; For, 1. The Council gives no reason why it forbids the Cup; and to bind men to believe it was moved with good reason, when it gives no reason, seems strange. 2. Though it were lawful in it self to forbid the use of the Cup, which yet had been used in the first institution of the Sacrament, and

practised

practiſed afterwards; yet ſtill it is no reaſon to bind men to believe that the Church had juſt cauſes and reaſons for the forbidding it. Whether it had juſt cauſes for the communicating without the Cup is meerly a matter of fact, and there can be no reaſon to ground an Article of faith upon the fact of man, or oblige men *jure divino*, to believe that thing was juſtly commanded or forbid, when yet they were bound to obſerve the decree only *jure humano*. For though the Church may have power to command where God hath not forbid, yet what ſhe doth command in things which are alterable in their nature, ſhe may upon occaſion forbid, yet there is no reaſon to make it an Article of Faith, that the Church doth always change her determinations upon juſt reaſons, or that the Church in theſe determinations never abuſes her power. 3. The reaſon aſſigned from the danger of irreverence was as ſtrong againſt the firſt inſtitution, and the primitive practice, as now. If therefore notwithſtanding this danger Chriſt thought fit to inſtitute it in both kinds,

and the Church then to practise it, there can be no reason from that pretence to prohibit the receiving in both kinds. And thus the Author of the History of the Council saith *, that the reasons produced out of *Gerson* concerning irreverence were thought ridiculous, because those dangers might more easily be withstood in these times, than they could in those twelve first ages, when the Church was in greater poverty. So that now to deny the Cup when it was formerly granted, is to deny it where there is the least fear of this inconvenience, and to allow it where there is the most danger. Thus this Doctrine is full of uncertaintie, no certainty that the Church hath power to restrain the Laity from either species. Some will have the Bread necessary and not the Cup, and some of them allow the Church a power to forbid the Bread if it give the Cup, so *Bellarmine* *. But here's no certainty of such a power, and no certainty that the Church hath upon just causes forbid the Cup, and therefore we cannot be bound to believe and profess this. Further, as the

* *L. 6 p. 521.*

* *L. 4. de Euchar. c. 27. ſ. octava ratio.*

the grounds of this Doctrine and practice are wholly uncertain, ſo they are inconſiſtent with the prayers yet retained in their own Offices, and appears from ſome paſſages yet found in them to be meerly a novelty. The Council of *Trent* acknowledges the frequent uſe of both kinds in the Primitive Church, yet would perſwade us alſo that the practice in one kind was uſual, and eſpecially in the Roman Church, which thing is ſo far from any colour of truth, that both in the Antient and Modern Offices there appears evidence enough that in the publick ordinary Maſſes there was alwaies a diſtribution of the Cup, as well as of the Bread. I ſpeak not of extraordinary caſes where neceſſity gives a diſpenſation from poſitive Laws, but publickly in the Church the Sacrament was given in both kinds for many ages. *Caſſander* aſſures us for above a thouſand years. And that there was no other publick uſual diſtribution of the Sacrament than in both kinds, we need no other proof than the prayers and Rubricks in their own Offices; and why ſhould the

prayers constantly imply the giving of both kinds, if usually in the publique administration of the Sacrament it was only given in one kind? Why also should the Rubricks and rules in their Offices either expresly require the distribution of the Cup, or at least imply a necessity of the Wine as well as the Bread, if the Bread only was given? Sometimes we find that they gave the Bread dipt in the Wine to the people, so it was practised in the Latin Churches *, but even these, (as *Cassander* observes,) judged that both kinds were necessary to a full and perfect communion: for to what end should they dip the Bread into the mystical wine of the blood of the Lord, if the Bread alone and by it self sufficed to a full and lawful Communion? The Original of that custom was the fear of shedding the blood, and therefore they gave the people not the Bread and Wine severally but the Bread dipt in the Wine, but yet they did not think the Bread alone sufficient, unless they did some way or other partake of the Wine.

* *Cassand. de Sacr. Con. sub utraq; spec.*

I confeſs this cuſtom was condemned by Pope *Julius*, (and the ſame prohibition is found alſo in the —— *) who in a letter to the Biſhops of *Egypt* forbids this kind of dipping, and tells them that according to the Lords inſtitution the Bread and the Wine muſt be received ſeverally. * Well, but ſtill, whether they uſed this cuſtom or uſed it not, yet they did judge that the wine ought to be received as well as the bread, for thoſe who did not like that way of dipping the bread into the Wine, would have the Wine given as well as the Bread, and plead Chriſts inſtitution for their warrant. And further, if it were not lawful to receive the Bread dipt in the Wine, and that this was unlawful according to the inſtitution in the Goſpel, it muſt needs be as unlawful in their judgement to give the Bread without Wine, for the Church might as well alter the manner of receiving, as take away the uſe of the Cup, and might as well appoint the receiving of the Wine in the Bread, as forbid the receiving of the Wine at all. Again, we find it was a cuſtom in the Church

* *Conc. Brac. 3. can. 1.*

* *Microlog. c. 19.*

of *Rome*, that upon Thursday before Easter, they consecrated the Wine by the Lords Prayer and the immission of the Lords body that the people might fully communicate: * at that time then they did not think it a complete communion, unless the people did receive the Wine as well as the Bread: and in the *Ordo Romanus* * 'tis sayd, that the Arch-deacon confirms all with the Lords blood whom the Pope had Communicated with the Lords body: and as the Arch-deacon confirms with the Cup those to whom the Pope had given the Bread, so the Deacons confirm with the Cup those to whom the Bishops and Priests had Communicated, the Bread. *Bellarmin* * pretends from hence an evidence of communicating in the publique solemn administration of the Sacrament in one kind; for the wine with which the Arch-deacon confirms was not consecrated, but was called the Cup of the Blood, because it was consecrated by the touching of the Lords blood: the blood was (sayes he) usually consecrated in a small chalice, and then

* *Microlog. c. 19.*

* *Qualiter celebr. sit offic. Miss.*

* *L. 4. de Euch. c. 24. ss. ordo.*

for

for the peoples communicating that was poured into a great Chalice full of wine and water, and out of this great chalice the people after they had received the body was wont to drink; now this was not consecrated but only by touching that part of the blood which was poured into it. But still it matters not whether this become Christs blood by consecration or contact; for it's enough for my purpose that they judged it was made Christs blood by the contact: and so it is sayd there, that *vinum non consecratum sed sanguine Domini commixtum sanctificatur per omnem modum*, they thought it sanctified to become sacramentally the blood of Christ, and therefore they give it to the people. This was the custom plainly in the *Roman* Church, when the Pope sayd Mass: and though some other places might out of a fancy of greater reverence leave the practice and introduce a receiving in one kind, yet it was but in some places even in *Thomas Aquinas* his * time. But yet the prayers in the publique Offices refer only

* *Sum. 3. part q. 80. ar. 12.*

ly to this cuſtom of receiving in both kinds; and it would be very ſtrange that the prayers ſhould alway refer to both kinds, when yet it was as uſual to receive in one kind; or that thoſe who compoſed the prayers ſhould conſtantly mention the receiving of both kinds, when yet they received uſually in one kind: he that conſults the Miſſals will ſee that they did communicate as well as conſecrate in both kinds, and that there is not the leaſt ſyllable whereby we may gather the excluſion of the people from the Cup. In the Prayers at the Maſs we find them confeſſing that they were *repleti alimoniâ cæleſti & ſpiritali poculo recreati*, filled with Heavenly food and refreſht will ſpiritual drink; that they were *refecti cibo potuque cæleſti*, refreſht both with meat and drink *, that they were *corporis ſacri & pretioſi ſanguinis repleti libamine*, repleniſht both with his body and blood. If the general cuſtom (when theſe prayers were compoſed) was to communicate in one kind, why ſhould they ſtill mention the re-

* *Miſſ. Rom. Feſt. Inv. S. Cruc. Feſt. S. Paul. Erem. poſt Communic.*

refreſhing by the Cup, by the drink, by the pretious blood, of partaking of his body and blood: why ſhould they ſay that they have received the Sacraments of his body and blood? * The Romaniſts cannot expound theſe places of receiving the blood in the body, by the fiction of concomitancy, for then they received only the Sacrament of his body, as the Bread is the Sacrament of his body, but here the Prayer ſpeaks of both, that they had received the Sacraments of both body and blood; and therefore this cannot be ſalved by the eating barely of the Bread: But this is more plain ſtill from an hymn which was to be ſung at the Dedication of a Church, and begins, *Chriſte cunctorum*; this hymn is extant among the hymns publiſht by *George Caſſander*, and runs thus.

* *Miſſ. prope Feſt. cod. min. Feſt. præclar. poſt com.*

Hæc

Hæc Domus ritè tibi dedicata
Noſcitur, in quâ populus ſacratum
Corpus aſſumit, bibit & beatum
Sanguinis hauſtum.

That is; that this Church was Dedicated to God, in which the people received the conſecrated body, and drunk the bleſſed draught of the blood. If at that time the people only received the Bread, how could they then ſing that in that Church the people receives the body and drinks the blood? Or if it were only the blood in the body, how could they be ſayd to drink the blood, when they eat the body? For no man can be ſayd to drink when he eats, no more than a man can be ſayd to eat when he drinks: here are the publique Prayers, which ſhew that then there was no publick communicating in one kind, for why ſhould they ſay, that then the people drank the blood, when it was plain they were forbid to drink? Why ſhould they ſay that in the Church the people drank the blood, as well as

eat

eat the body, when yet the Romaniſts pretend that for many ages it was otherwiſe. They could not certainly uſe theſe forms, if they had not received in both kinds, nor in their Offices ſpeak ſo frequently of receiving in both kinds, if the cuſtom was frequently to receive in one kind: And if there be theſe forms, then it follows that the Prayers yet retained in the Romiſh Church do prove this practice a meer innovation.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

I Propound this consideration that the Protestants in most points now controverted betwixt them and the Romanists take that way, which according to the *Romish* Concessions is the safest. It is a common rule on which the Romanists do much insist, that where two parties do differ, 'tis the safest way to take that which they agree in: but the most of the Doctrines held by the Protestants are owned by the Papists; it follows therefore that the Protestants take the safest course. As for the proposition on which I found this consideration, I press it no further than according to the opinion of the Romanists, for thus they deal with ignorant Protestants; 'Tis the safest course, say they, in which both parties agree; but both parties agree there is possibility of salvation among Papists, whereas the Papists deny any possibility of salvation among Protestants; therefore it's the safest course to leave the

the Proteſtants and turn Papiſts. Now on this very principle, I argue that the Proteſtants take the ſafeſt way. 1. In the adoration of images, the Proteſtanrs ſay they ought to abſtain from the worſhip of images, and they found their judgement on a plain Command, Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven image, nor the likeneſs of any thing in Heaven or Earth, *&c.* thou ſhalt not bow down to them nor worſhip them; now both agree, it is not neceſſary to adore them, and that no man ſins in not adoring them, that there is no Command of God requiring this adoration, and that to give a Religious reſpect to an Image which God forbids is Idolatry, though they do not give the inward reſpect. Or elſe the three Children might have been excuſed from Idolatry if they had fallen down and worſhip'd the Image which *Nebuchadnezzar* ſet up, becauſe they might ſtill plead that they gave only an outward reſpect without an inward. Both agree that men may perform a true ſincere reſpect to the thing repreſented (as they think) by the Image, though

though they do not direct their respect by the Image to the thing represented. As a man may truly love Christ, and inwardly reverence him as the Author of eternal salvation, though he do not express this inward reverence by the outward respect to that which some frame for an Image of him. Both agree that every action which we perform to the Image cannot be warranted by the pretence of the inward intention, that we do intend to honour the thing represented by it: for then a man might pray to the Image of Christ, on pretence of honouring Christ. Take then what both agree in, and it must needs be the safer way according to the Protestants to abstain from the worship of Images, than to practise it according to the Romanists, for the one sayes it is sin to worship them, the other cannot say 'tis sin in abstaining from worshipping them; the one sayes, 'tis a dishonouring God to worship the Creature, whether they worship it for it self or for another, the other cannot say that 'tis a dishonouring God to abstain from worshipping the Creature

and

and directing our worship immediately to God himself.

2. I instance in the practice of Invocation of Saints. The Protestants say, that God alone is to be invoked through Christ, that Christ is appointed the Mediator betwixt God and man, both to make reconciliation by his death, and to intercede for us in Heaven, that he is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto God by him, for he ever liveth to perform this Office of Intercession for us, that he is heartily affected with the miseries of his people, and therefore we may come boldly to the throne of grace and find help in time of need. So that now they think 'tis sufficient to fly to the merits and intercession of Christ, and therefore to make use of the intercession of any other either to God or Christ without a command is either a distrust of his willingness to intercede for them, or of his power to help them. Now both agree, 'tis not necessary to pray to Saints, that there is no command obliging them to pray to them, that no man sins

in not making uſe of the interceſſion of Saints, yea laſtly, the Romaniſts cannot ſay, that our prayers are not heard as ſoon and anſwered as effectually when we make our requeſts in the name of Chriſt to his Father, as when we deſire the interceſſion of Saints. So then if it be the ſafeſt way to take that courſe which both judge fartheſt from ſin, then 'tis ſafer to abſtain from the invocation of Saints (for both agree there is no ſin in abſtaining) than to practiſe the invocation of Saints according to the Romaniſts, for then (ſay the Proteſtants) they muſt ſin.

3. I inſtance in the practice of denying the Cup to the Laity. The Proteſtants ſay that the rule for the Celebration of theſe Ordinances, is the inſtitution of the Law-giver, and therefore Saint *Paul*, to rectifie the abuſes crept into the Celebration of the Lords Supper in the Church of *Corinth*, brings them back to the primitive inſtitution, as the unalterable rule which they ought to follow. They ſay that Chriſt adminiſtred the Sacrament to his Diſciples in both kinds, that

that they all drank of the Cup as well as ate of the Bread, that there appears as full an obligation that the Priests should deliver the Cup to the Laity as well as the Bread, for he says Drink ye all of this as well as Eat; that they should do the one as well as the other in remembrance of him; and therefore to take away the Cup is a violation of Christs institution, an usurpation of authority which Christ never gave. Now the Romanists on the other hand acknowledge, that Christ did institute in both kinds, that the primitive Church for some ages did practise accordingly *, that since the Sacrament was instituted in both kinds, it must necessarily be received by some persons in both kinds, so far *Bellarmin* confesses *, though he will not have it necessarily received by all; that the prohibition of the Cup is only by the Churches authority, and setting that aside, it is no sin to distribute in both kinds, and therefore they allow the *Grecians* and *Maronites* (who submit to the Pope) the use of the Cup.

* *Conc. Const. sess.* 13. *Conc. Trid. sess.* 21.

* *L.* 4. *de Euch. c.* 23.

Thus then I argue, the practice of the Proteſtants is the ſafer way, for there can be no ſin in giving the Cup according to Chriſts inſtitution, and ſo far they both agree. Now it is the ſafer to take that courſe which both judge farther from ſin: there can be no ſin in adhering to that which Chriſt inſtituted, and the primitive Church practiſed: but both Proteſtants and Papiſts acknowledge that Chriſt inſtituted in both kinds, and the primitive Church practiſed in both kinds; therefore the Proteſtants take the ſafer way.

4. I inſtance in the Adoration of the Sacrament: The Proteſtants ſay, that 'tis not lawful to adore the bleſſed Sacrament, for then they muſt adore meer Bread and Wine, and give the glory to the creature, which is due to the Creator, God bleſſed for ever. They ſay, that they ſee it is Bread, they taſte it is Bread, they ſmell it is Bread, and unleſs their reaſon and ſenſe be deceived it is Bread, and therefore they hold it is Idolatry to worſhip it. Farther, ſuppoſing the doctrine

of

of Tranſubſtantiation to be true, that the Bread was turned into Chriſts Body, yet ſtill many ſay, it is ſtill not lawful to adore the Sacrament, for though the body be preſent under the ſpecies of Bread, yet his preſence doth not make the things where, in he is preſent capable of the ſame Divine honour with himſelf, or elſe his very clothes which he wore muſt needs be worſhip'd with Divine worſhip, becauſe he was preſent under thoſe clothes. 'Tis plain the Sacrament is diſtinct from the body that is preſent in the Sacrament, or elſe when we ſay, Chriſts body is in the Sacrament, it would ſignifie no more than if we ſaid, Chriſts body is preſent in it ſelf; but now if the body be diſtinct from the Sacrament, and that the body is in the Sacrament, yet Chriſts preſence in the Sacrament will not make the Sacrament it ſelf to be adored. Many Proteſtants do ſay, that though his body be preſent under the ſpecies, yet 'tis Idolatry to worſhip it, for the primary reaſon which the Romaniſts give for the adoration in the Sacrament, is, becauſe Chriſt hath ſaid,

this is my Body, and therefore the proper ground of Adoration muſt be the bodily preſence of Chriſt; but if the body cannot be the proper object of Worſhip, becauſe it is a creature, then upon the account of his bodily preſence there can be no proper ground of Adoration, and therefore at the beſt it muſt be uncertain whether I may worſhip Chriſt as preſent in his humane nature there. On this ground they abſtain from the Adoration of the Hoſt. On the other hand the Papiſts cannot ſay it is neceſſary to worſhip the Hoſt; for they cannot ſay that God commanded the Adoration of the Hoſt, or that the Apoſtles did Worſhip it; they cannot ſay that we ſin in not worſhipping the Hoſt; for though we ought to worſhip Chriſt, though in the general it be true, that every one ought to worſhip Chriſt, yet if I do not bow the knee to him in the Hoſt, I do not ſin, for there is no particular command *hîc & nunc* to perform this external Adoration to him: though I am bound to worſhip God, yet I am not bound to an external Adoration of him in every

place,

place, or in every immediate object in which God is. It does not follow, God is to be worſhip'd, therefore I muſt worſhip him in the Sun or Moon: So it does not follow Chriſt is to be Worſhip'd, therefore I muſt worſhip him in the Hoſt. It does not follow, God is to be worſhip'd, therefore to be worſhip'd in this ſtone, for that would excuſe the Idolatry of the wiſeſt Heathens who worſhip'd (as they ſay) not the ſtone, but God in the ſtone: no more will it follow, Chriſt is to be worſhipped, therefore I am bound to worſhip him in the Hoſt. Again, the Romaniſts do not deny but that we may perform a true ſpiritual worſhip to Chriſt, without diminution of our real reſpect to him, though we direct our worſhip immediately to Chriſt in the Heavens, or though we primarily direct our worſhip to Chriſt in the Heavens, whoſe paſſion is repreſented to us in the holy Sacrament, and the benefits of whoſe death are there offered to us. They will not ſay that no man can give a true inward ſpiritual worſhip to Chriſt, unleſs he does give

this outward worſhip to Chriſts body in the Hoſt. They cannot ſay, that 'tis want of love to Chriſt, not to worſhip him there, where they know not whether he be or no; or that 'tis want of true reſpect to Chriſt to omit thoſe outward acts of worſhip, when they know not whether he will accept them or no. Again, they do acknowledge, that if Chriſt be not there under the ſpecies, if the bread be not tranſubſtantiated into the body, that then they muſt needs be Idolaters, yea guilty of ſuch an Idolatry as had not been ſeen or heard of in the world; and therefore the errour of the Heathens who worſhipped Statues of Gold or Silver, or the *Lappians* that worſhipped a red Cloth, or the *Ægyptians* that worſhipped any living Creature, would be more tolerable, than of the Chriſtians who worſhip a bit of bread. * Again, that it is very poſſible that they may be guilty of Idolatry in worſhipping the Hoſt; for if the bread be not tranſubſtantiated, then they do worſhip only bread, and though they believe the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation

* *Coſter. Enchir Controv. c. 8. de Euch. ſacr. arg. 10.*

tiation to be true, and that by the words of Conſecration ſpoken by a lawful Prieſt with a right intention this change is wrought; yet in particular they cannot be aſſured, that this change is wrought, and that this individual bread is turned actually into the body of Chriſt; for they neither know whether the Prieſt who Conſecrates be a lawful Prieſt, nor whether he really intended to Conſecrate that very Wafer, which they are about to adore. There is none of the Romiſh Communion but will ſay, that if it be not tranſubſtantiate, 'tis but bread, and he that worſhips bread, whatever his intention is, is materially an Idolater: and further, that he can have no other ground to believe that this Wafer is Conſecrate, than his hopes of the Prieſts honeſty; but if the Prieſt ſhould prove a knave and maliciouſly ſuſpend his intention, then he runs the hazard of committing Idolatry, at beſt of worſhipping he knows not what. And now then the practice of the Proteſtants muſt be the ſafer way; for if they ſay true, then

'tis

'tis Idolatry to worſhip the Hoſt, and the Romaniſts cannot ſay that we ſin againſt a Divine Command in not worſhipping it. The Proteſtants ſay, at beſt they run the danger of Idolatry, and 'tis the ſafeſt courſe to avoid the danger of ſin as much as they can: the Romaniſts cannot ſay that there is any danger of Idolatry in abſtaining from giving Adoration. The Proteſtants ſay 'tis unlawful to worſhip the Hoſt, and the Romaniſts cannot ſay 'tis neceſſary to worſhip it: or that there can be no ſpiritual worſhip acceptable to Chriſt without this external worſhip of him in the Hoſt.

5. I inſtance in the celebration of Divine Service in an unknown tongue. The Proteſtants ſay that 'tis fit that all people ſhould offer God a rational ſervice: that if men pray in a language which they do not underſtand, that they only offer the ſacrifice of fools: that it is repugnant to the uſe of Vocal prayers, which are the expreſſion of our inward deſires to God, for thoſe things we want,

want; but we cannot be ſaid to expreſs our deſires in words, if we do not underſtand what we ſay: That Prayer if it be not underſtood is only the act of the Lips and not of the Heart, and muſt needs want that inward zeal and earneſtneſs, thoſe acts of faith, and hope, relyance and truſting on God, which make our Prayers properly acceptable to him: that they cannot anſwer *Amen* to thoſe Prayers, as the Apoſtle requires, (*i.e.*) that they conſent to thoſe prayers, and joyn with the Prieſt in thoſe petitions, unleſs they underſtand thoſe prayers. Thus the Proteſtants condemn thoſe Prayers in an unknown tongue, as unſutable to the nature and uſe of Vocal Prayer, and derogating from the true affection and devotion required in Prayer. On the other hand the Papiſts cannot ſay it is unlawful to pray in a language, which they do underſtand, for themſelves in their private prayers frequently uſe that language they do underſtand. They cannot ſay that Chriſt hath commanded the uſe of the Greek or Latin tongue more than any other

other in their publick Service: or that words ſpoken in thoſe tongues are of more efficay with God than words ſpoken in their mother-tongue: or that words which we do not underſtand conduce more to ſtir up devotion, than thoſe words which we do underſtand. I confeſs ſome Papiſts have ventured very far (I'le inſtance for one in *Coſterus**) and tell us that there is a fruit of prayer, though they underſtand not what they ſay, that is, a conjunction of the mind with God, and that in the meditation of him they find an admirable comfort though they know not what they are ſaying, and that the words which they do ſpeak, though they be not underſtood, do much increaſe that comfort, even as the holineſs of the place, though they think not of it, does excite and ſtir up devotion: and he tells us, that if the words of the Charmers have ſome efficacy on Serpents, though they want underſtanding, much more do the ſacred words of God, though they be not underſtood, affect and move men. But this

* *Enchir. contr. cap. 17. p. 497.*

is

is to turn prayers into charms, and aſcribe efficacy to the bare ſound of words. But many others will not deny, that the people are as much or more edified by the prayers in a known tongue, than an unknown. *Eſtius* * ſays, that take it by it ſelf, it is good that divine Offices be celebrated in a tongue which the people underſtands, for that conduces to edification, and that the text of the Apoſtle proves it. *Cajetane* goes higher, and ſays it is better for their edification: and if it were not, why have ſome Councils commanded that ſuch as cannot learn diſtinctly the Lords Prayer and Creed in Latine, ſhould be taught them in the vulgar tongue? And yet the Rhemiſts ſay this has been done. And now then the practice of the Proteſtants muſt be the ſafer way, for both agree that prayer in a tongue which they do underſtand, ſerves much for edification, and conduces to quicken devotion, and inflame their zeal in Prayer: Both agree that 'tis fit, that people ſhould endeavour to underſtand the contents of their Prayers; both agree that

* In 1 Cor. 14. 17.

Rhemiſt. teſt. in 1 Cor. 14.

that there is no ſin in praying in a language which they do underſtand. If it be the ſafeſt to take that courſe in which they agree, and leave that in which they differ, then 'tis ſafer to follow the Proteſtants in this point than the Papiſts.

I might inſtance in the ſacrifice of the Maſs. Both parties agree that in the Lords Supper there is a Sacrifice; we only differ what kind of Sacrifice: the Proteſtants own a Sacrifice of praiſe, a Sacrifice of Alms, and a Sacrifice of our ſelves. And the Engliſh Church in her publick Liturgie after the diſtribution of the Cup, uſes theſe words, We offer unto thee our ſelves, our ſouls and bodies to be a reaſonable, holy and lively Sacrifice unto thee. Beſides theſe Sacrifices the Proteſtants acknowledge a commendrative Sacrifice, that there is a repreſentation of the Sacrifice on the Croſs, that there is a memorial of his paſſion, and thus far the Romaniſts agree. But then they go further, and they oblige us to believe that there is a true real external Sacrifice, a Sacrifice propitiatory for the living and the

the dead, *&c.* Now if this principle be true, then 'tis ſafer to acknowledge a figurative Sacrifice which both own, than a real proper Sacrifice which the Proteſtants diſown.

I might add, both parties agree that the Scriptures are a rule, and as perfect a rule (ſaith *Knot*) as a writing can be: (but if whatever the Apoſtles Preached, they might write, and whatever traditions the Church hath received it might ſet down in writing, then a writing may be a perfect rule.) The Proteſtants deny Doctrinal traditions to be a rule, therefore 'tis ſafeſt to follow them. Again, both parties agree that the books of Scripture which the Proteſtants own to be Canonical are Canonical, but the Proteſtants reject the *Apocryphal*; therefore ſtill it muſt be ſafer to follow the Proteſtants. There is one thing I will particularly inſiſt on; Both parties agree that in the Engliſh Liturgy there is no poſitive error; there are (ſay ſome of them) ſome things wanting which they would have, but there is nothing which

they

they can ſay is ſinful; moſt of the prayers are taken out of the antient Liturgies, many of them to be found in their own Miſſal, as *S. C.* confeſſes; and 'tis known the Engliſh Reformers did only deſign to reform, not totally to aboliſh, to purge out the corruptions, and reform that which they ſaw unfit in the Offices, and not to aboliſh what was good and uſeful. What therefore remains and is uſed in our Liturgy, cannot be cenſured for erroneous and ſinful. And thus far both agree that the matter of the prayers is good, that the form of the prayers to God through the mediation of Jeſus Chriſt is very good, that there is no rite required in our Offices which is ſuperſtitious or unlawful: ſo that the Romaniſts cannot ſay that there is any reaſon from the prayers and Offices uſed in our Church why they might not joyn in them. If the prayers were good in Latin and might be lawfully uſed when they were not underſtood, there can be no reaſon why they ſhould be bad when they were tranſlated into Engliſh. The

omiſſi-

omiſſion of ſome rites uſed in the Offices is no ſubſtantial alteration, the omiſſion of ſome Reſponds, Anthems, Invitatories, *&c.* which our Reformers judged ſuperfluous or inconvenient, doth not make the reſt of the prayers and Offices unlawful; the difference in the method and order of prayers doth not make the ſervice to be ſin, for there were diverſities in ſaying and ſinging within this Realm; ſome followed the uſe of *Sarum*, ſome of *Hereford*, ſome of *Bangor*, &c. yet all approved; though in the Litany the *ora pro nobis* to the ſeveral ranks and orders of Saints be omitted, yet the ſupplication to the three perſons ſeverally or jointly is good ſtill: though ſome petitions be left out, the reſt which remain, if they might be uſed before, they may be uſed ſtill. So that this is granted by the Romaniſts who have weighed the prayers and ſervice of our Church, that there is no poſitive error in our Prayers, that there is nothing in the Liturgy of our Church which can be condemned for error or impiety, or give

juſt ground to the Romaniſts for a refuſal to joyn in the uſe of it. And therefore during the time of *Edward* the ſixth we hear of no Recuſants that refuſed to be preſent at the Service; and when Queen *Elizabeth* came to the Crown (if our Engliſh Hiſtorians, who generally relate this ſtory, do not bely him) *Pius* the fourth offered to confirm the Liturgy, provided that She would own his Supremacy. I confeſs the Romaniſts exclaim heavily againſt the Sacrament in our Churches, *Suarez* * for inſtance calls it a ſacrilegious Supper, and a feigned Eucharift, and ſaith that thoſe who participate of it do evidently cooperate with an Infidel Superſtition, and take that for the Sacrament of Chriſt whichis nothing. But upon a ſerious conſideration of theſe things I cannot ſee what benefit can be had by the Sacrament in the Romiſh Church, which is not to be had from the Sacrament in ours. Suppoſe we do not own the corporal preſence of Chriſt under the Species, yet I cannot ſee any real benefit which the receiver can have from

* *Def. fid. Cath. l. 6. c. 9. n. 29.*

from the Sacrament adminiſtred among them, and cannot be had from the Sacrament adminiſtred among us: for whether it be bread in its own nature, or the body under the bread, yet the bare external eating doth no way confer or increaſe grace in the receiver. If a wicked as well as godly man may eat Chriſts body, yea if a Mouſe as well as a Man may eat it, then there is no ſpiritual bleſſing to the bare eating of the body. Let a man be wicked who eats of the Sacrament, and tell me then whether the eating of Chriſts fleſh would profit any thing; or whether he that eats the fleſh and drinks the blood of Chriſt, whether in its own ſhape, or under the ſpecies of bread and wine, ſhall live for ever? So that now as to an unworthy Receiver here is nothing to be had, whether the bread be tranſubſtantiate or no. Suppoſe again, a man be truely godly, what doth the eating of Chriſts body in their opinion more benefit him, than the Sacrament can do according to ours? Wherein is a man more benefited by

eating Christs body under the ſpecies, than if he eat that which is bread in its nature, but according to Chriſts inſtitution repreſents his body? To talk of Chriſts body in their ſence quickning and inlivening us, is ſtrange, for men may eat the body, and yet continue dead in their ſins. To ſay that by eating of the body in the Sacrament that we abide in Chriſt, and Chriſt in us, is very ſtrange too; for neither doth Chriſts body become part of our bodies, nor can we by receiving his body with our mouths be ſaid to abide in him, unleſs by eating of Chriſts body we conceive a converſion of our bodies into his body. To call the body of Chriſt as it is under the ſpecies, a ſpiritual nouriſhment of the ſoul, is as ſtrange a fancy, for I never could ſee how the food of the body properly nouriſheth the ſoul: if it does nouriſh the ſoul it muſt be done in a moral, not natural way; now I ſee not why the Sacrament in our way cannot as truly nouriſh the ſoul, as they conceive the eating of the body doth in their way. The nouriſhing of the ſoul is to be conſidered

not

not ſo much from the things we outwardly receive into our mouths, for properly theſe things can never nouriſh the ſoul, as from the ſacramental inſtitution. And ſo the Manna by Gods inſtitution became ſpiritual food, and the water out of the Rock ſpiritual drink *; and though the things in themſelves were but bread and water, yet in a ſpiritual ſence they ate and drank Chriſt: and ſo here, the bread which we break is the Communion of the body of Chriſt. And we do as really partake of the benefits of his paſſion, as we do feed on theſe outward elements, and we ſpiritually are nouriſhed, our graces increaſed, and our hearts refreſhed. Thus whatever the Romaniſts pretend, there's no more benefit to be had by the Sacrament adminiſtred in the Romiſh Church than in ours; our Miniſtry conveys as great things as they ſpeak of, only according to our Doctrine men muſt do ſomething more of the work themſelves: as one very well adds, We pretend not to ſend wicked men to Heaven with a word, but we can help the

* 1 Cor. 10. 3, 4.

thoughts and affections of pious ſouls as much as they with all their skill and power. The Rhemiſts much cenſure the celebration of the Euchariſt among us, and call it *Calvins* Supper, * a Table and Cup of Devils, wherein the Devil is properly ſerved, and Chriſts honour defiled; * yet really upon a ſerious peruſal of the whole Communion Service, they cannot ſay that there is any poſitive error: though the Church of *England* hath omitted ſundry Ceremonies which are now uſed in the Maſs, yet the omiſſion of a Ceremony doth not make the ſervice ſinful: though it appoint the bread to be ſuch as is uſual to be eaten at the Table, when the Romiſh Church uſes Wafers, yet they cannot ſay it is unlawful, for our Saviour at the firſt inſtitution uſed ſuch bread, and it is no more unlawful here, than among the reconciled *Grecians*, where the holy bread is made after the manner of a Cake, and is cut in pieces by the Prieſt with a ſacred Knife: though it appoint the bread to be broken before the

* *Rhem. Annot. on Jo. 4. 4. ſect. 4.*

* *Annot. on* 1 Cor. 10. 21.

Goar. in Εὐχολ. *in miſſ. Chryſ. n. 29, 30.*

the words of conſecration are finiſhed, that is, at the mentioning in the rehearſal of the inſtitution thoſe words, *he brake*, when the Romiſh Church appoints it afterwards, that the Prieſt ſhall break the Hoſt into three parts, and put one of them into the Chalice; yet ſtill it is not unlawful, and more agreeable to our Saviours practice in the firſt inſtitution, who firſt bleſſed and brake before he uſed thoſe words, *this is my body*. Though it appoint the bread to be given into the hands of them that do Communicate, whenas the Romiſh Church requires it to be put into the mouth, yet ſtill the order of the Engliſh Church is not unlawful. Though the words of conſecration be ſpoken that all may hear and be inſtructed, when the Romiſh Church requires them to be ſpoken ſecretly; yet ſtill the order is not unlawful, and certainly more agreeable to the Primitive practice and the Liturgies of the Eaſtern Churches *. Though our Liturgie requires the conſecrated bread to be eaten in the Church, where-

* *Litur. Baſilii & Chryſoſt.*

as the Romiſh Church reſerves it to be adored, or carried to the ſick, *&c.* yet ſtill the order is not unlawful, for none can ſay that reſervation is always neceſſary, or that it is an unlawful celebration of the Euchariſt becauſe it is omitted. So for mingling water with wine, the Church of *Rome* practiſes it, the *Engliſh* omit it; for there being no command for it, nor ſufficient evidence that it was univerſally practiſed in the Apoſtles times, the Communion Service is not by the omiſſion of it made unlawful. The Romaniſts themſelves confeſs, that though water be not mingled with the wine, yet it doth not ceaſe to be a Sacrament *. Thus though many Ceremonies uſed by the Romaniſts be omitted or altered in our Liturgie, yet ſtill there is no ſuperſtition, nor poſitive error. Again, though there be ſome alteration in the Prayers, yet there is nothing in the prayers we uſe, which they do or can except againſt as erroneous and heretical. They cannot blame the General Confeſſion, in which we acknowledge

* *Catech. Roman. cap. 4. ſect. 16.*

ledge our former tranſgreſſions, profeſs our hearty ſorrow for them, deſire him to forgive the ſins that are paſt, and beg grace for the future that they may ſerve and pleaſe him in newneſs of life to the honour and glory of his name. They cannot blame the Abſolution which is much the ſame with that in the *Ordo Miſſæ*, *miſereatur veſtri Omnipotens Deus*, &c. that Almighty God would have mercy on them, deliver them from their ſins, and bring them to his everlaſting Kingdom. They cannot cenſure the ſhort ſentences which follow the Abſolution, which are deſigned for the incouragement, and comfort of poor ſinners, who are heartily grieved for their ſins. That antient exhortation, Lift up your hearts, with the verſicles following are uſed by the Romaniſts; the proper prefaces are on ſome daies the ſame which were uſed in the Romiſh Church, and thoſe which are uſed on other daies are more full and expreſs in declaring the bleſſing which God at that time beſtowed on his Church, but no way to be taxed

taxed with any error. They cannot blame that prayer in which we diſclaim all confidence on our own righteouſneſs, and caſt our ſelves on Gods mercy, beſeeching him that we may ſo eat the fleſh of Chriſt and drink his blood, that our bodies may be made clean by his body, and our ſouls waſhed through his moſt precious blood, *&c.* for the Romaniſts do pray that God would give them who truſt in the multitude of his mercies a part and fellowſhip with the Saints, and admit them into their ſociety not weighing their merits but beſtowing pardon on them. *

* *Can. Miſſæ, Oratio nobis quoque.*

They cannot blame the prayer of Conſecration: For the Preface in which we acknowledge the ſufficiency of that one oblation on the Croſs for the ſatisfaction of the ſins of the world, and that Chriſt did command us to keep a continual remembrance of his paſſion till his coming again, which is one principal end of the inſtitution of the Sacrament: Theſe things they do not blame. For the petition, that receiving theſe Creatures of Bread

Bread and Wine according to Chriſts holy Inſtitution, we may be partakers of his moſt bleſſed body and blood; neither can they fault this, for it is ſutable to that very prayer in their Maſs, when the Prieſt prays that the offering may be to them the body and blood of thy moſt beloved Son Jeſus Chriſts; * and to that in the Maſs of St. *Baſil*, where the Prieſt after he had repeated the words of conſecration, ſayes, We thy unworthy ſervants who are admitted to ſerve at thy Altar, not for our righteouſneſſes, (for we have done no good upon the earth) but for thy mercies, and compaſſions which thou haſt ſhed abundantly on us, do approch unto it; and placing before us the repreſentations of the holy body and blood of thy Chriſt, we pray thee, we beſeech thee, O holy of holies, for the good pleaſure of thy goodneſs, that thy holy Spirit may come down on us and on theſe gifts ſet before us, and bleſs them, and ſanctifie them. And afterwards he prayes again, Make this Bread the precious body of the Lord and God,

* *Can. Miſſæ, Oratio. quam oblationem.*

ἀντίτυπα.

God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and make this Cup the precious blood, *&c.* The narration of the Inſtitution (which is the Prieſts warrant for the uſe of this rite) they cannot cenſure, for it is expreſly taken out of St. *Luke*, and if there be any words added to the words of conſecration in the Romiſh Church, which are omitted by us, they themſelves cannot affirm that they are eſſentially neceſſary in the conſecration of the Sacrament. The words which the Prieſt uſes in the delivery of the elements are faultleſs: the firſt part, that is the prayer, is much the ſame with the form in the Romiſh Church; the latter part is an exhortation to receive theſe things in remembrance of Chriſts death and paſſion. The prayer after the receiving of the holy Sacrament is without the leaſt ſign of error: the hymn which follows is the *gloria in excelſis* mentioned in the *Ordo Miſſæ*. Thus take the whole ſervice, there is no prayer uſed which is taxed by the Romaniſts of error or ſuperſtition, nothing preſcribed which is ſimply unlawful.

lawful. On the other hand we ſay there is error and ſuperſtition in the Maſs, in the adoration of the Hoſt, in the invoking Gods protection by the Merits and Prayers of Saints, in the offering up the Hoſt in the honour of the Saints, * *&c.* Now then according to the principle layd down by the Romaniſts 'tis ſafeſt to hold that in which both diſſenting parties agree in; but both parties agree there is nor error or ſuperſtition in the Engliſh Communion ſervice, whereas the Proteſtants ſay there is error in the Romiſh Maſs; therefore it is ſafer to follow the Engliſh Proteſtants.

* *Can. Miſſ. Orat. Communicantes. Ordo Miſſ. Orat. ſuſcipe.*

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

I Will add one conſideration more, That the greateſt part of the Doctrine and practices in which we differ, do plainly tend to the advancement of the Clergy. And he that will ſeriouſly conſider the deſign and tendency of thoſe Doctrines may eaſily gueſs, that they ſpring not from piety but covetouſneſs, ambition, and love of wordly greatneſs, and are crafty contrivances by degrees to ſubject the Laity to the power of the Romiſh Prieſts. 'Tis true the followers of a party may eſteem thoſe Doctrines for Divine inſpirations, which have been the plauſible inſinuations of their Ring-leaders for their own advantage. Many do like the *Iſraelites*, follow *Abſolom* in ſimplicity of their heart, and being well meaning men are ſoon apt to believe

thoſe opinions which pretend to be ancient truths; but the frame and make of their Doctrines in which we differ, ſtrongly inſinuates that they are only contrivances to increaſe the power, wealth and authority of their Clergy. Though many are taken with the ſpecious pretences of Unity and Antiquity, and when they are once cozened into the belief of any religion they are loth to leave it, and as it falls out often with new proſelytes they are the ſtrongeſt Zealots: but let them ſeriouſly conſider and they will find that 'tis the intereſt of the Romiſh Clergy to maintain thoſe Doctrines in which they differ from us, that all this is worldly policy to advance themſelves, and unleſs they are reſolved to be cheated, they will much ſuſpect that Religion which chiefly ſeems to deſign the greatneſs and wealth and abſolute authority in the Prieſts, and principally preſcribes ſuch Doctrines for truths which tend to that end. Now 1. The Doctrine of Infallibility is plainly ſuted to the advancement of the Clergy, nothing tends more

more to gain authority and power to their Clergy, than the infallibility of their Church, (though themſelves are not yet fully agreed about the proper ſubject of infallibllity.) This makes the people intirely depend on their words, and ſubject their faith to their determinations; this wholly ſilences all doubts of any miſtakes in their Teachers; and what ever we ſee or hear, what ever our ſenſes do judge, or our reaſons do conclude of any thing, yet ſtill we muſt believe that we, but not they are miſtaken, for they do not, nor cannot erre: and be they never ſo ignorant and weak, ſo malicious and ſinful, yet ſtill what their Church ſhall determine to be truth, muſt be believed as the Oracles of God. Now nothing can more ſecure them in their power and Authority, in their repute and credit, than this pretence that they cannot err; for by this means they 1. Make all deſigns and indeavors for Reformation (further than they

they themſelves pleaſe) wholly needleſs. If they reform, then they confeſs they have erred, but becauſe they pretend that they cannot err, therefore they deny that there is any neceſſity of Reformation, and ſo ſtop all demands and deſires for it. Thus then if ignorance or ſuperſtition ſhould never ſo much increaſe, if any abuſes ſhould have crept into the Church, if any Tares ſhould ſecretly have grown up among the Wheat, yet it would be in vain to deſire any reformation, for they have ſecured themſelves by this Doctrine that the Church cannot err, and therefore what ever any perſons can plead, ſtill there is no need of Reformation. 2. They deſtroy all liberty of inquiring after truth, all uſe of means to find out what is truth; for there can be no means to find out what is truth, unleſs there be a liberty of examining the arguments on either ſide, & a readineſs to yield to thoſe arguments which are moſt ſatisfactory and convincing. But now by ſuppoſing that their Church cannot err, they make it unreaſonable to inquire

further, than what she hath said, and absurd to doubt of any thing she hath once delivered : and if they are once out of the way, 'tis impossible while they stick to this Tenent ever to bring them into the way. 3. Granting that in some Case the Church may err, for themselves confess they are only infallible in matters of faith, and that she hath gone beyond its due bounds, and determined in such things in which themselves acknowledge she hath no security from error, yet still on this pretence that she cannot err in matters of faith, they destroy much of the liberty of examining the Churches determinations, and make the people in those cases wholly dependant on the Clergies pleasure : for the question being put whether their Church hath determined in a matter of faith or fact rightfully or wrongfully, whether it hath erred in this particular case or no, and the Church determining it hath not erred, they are wholly bound up by the Churches determination : And though they see that their Church hath erred

erred in determining things beyond its power, yet they are bound to believe she hath not erred, because she hath so determined, that she hath not erred: If therefore she sayes it's a matter of faith which really is a matter of fact, they are bound to deny their own judgements, and acquiesce in the Churches infallibility. Thus this Doctrine is plainly suted to the advancement of the Pope and his Clergy.

2. The Doctrine of Traditions is plainly tending to that end; They tell us that we must receive the Scriptures and Traditions with an equal respect. Supposing this true that it was the same word whether written or not written, and that the circumstance of its being written or not written does not make any essential alteration, and that if we did know any Doctrine delivered by God, that we ought to receive it as infallibly true, though it had never been written; yet this being uncertain to us, whether God hath delivered any such thing, which never hath been written, we content our

ſelves with the holy Scriptures, and will not be wiſe above what is written. But now they tell us, that Traditions muſt be received with equal reſpect, and that the way to know which are theſe Traditions, is not to conſult the writings of the primitive times, but the practice of the Church, and becauſe there are many things now practiſed, which do not appear to have been practiſed in every Age from the Apoſtles downward, therefore they tell us that the way to try which are true traditions is by the judgement of the preſent Church. Thus the doctrine plainly makes for the honour and advancement of the Clergy, for none can tell how many are Apoſtolical Traditions but by their determination, and what they do ſay are Apoſtolical, muſt be believed to be ſo, becauſe they call them ſo.

3. The forbidding the reading of the Scriptures by the Laity ſpeaks the ſame end. They pretend that the Scriptures are ſo obſcure, that few can underſtand the true meaning of the Holy Ghoſt in the Doctrines and Rules

Rules there delivered; that unlearned men wreſt them to their own deſtruction, and that the common reading of them by the Laity is fit for nothing but to beget hereſies and diviſions in the Church; and therefore the Council of *Trent* forbids any to read them, unleſs they be licenſed by the Biſhop. Now why do they thus forbid the Reading of the Scriptures, unleſs to perſons Licenſed? Becauſe they think that the beſt way to preſerve the authority of the Prieſt is by ignorance of the people; that the people are beſt led when they are kept blindfold; that they ought to content themſelves with the inſtruction of their Paſtors, and that to give the people leave to read and ſearch the meaning of the Scriptures, is to make the Preachers Office needleſs; that it is enough for them to believe as the Church believes; but if men ſhould Read the Scriptures, they might controul their Teachers; but now by debarring the Laity from inquiring and ſearching

the Scriptures, they make them wholly dependant on the Prieſts, and force them to pin their faith on their ſleeves.

4. The ſame is plain from their keeping the whole Service in an unknown tongue; for by this means they neceſſitate the common people to live in ignorance, and not to underſtand what they pray; they neceſſitate them to patter over certain hard words, and content themſelves with ſeeing the antick geſtures or poſtures of the Prieſt, or hearing a ſound of words, which they can only hope mean well, but they know not whether they be bleſſings or curſings. But now to ſatisfie the minds of men, they perſwade them that it matters not whether they underſtand what they ſay or no; that they are not bound to attend to the words they ſpeak, * or know the meaning of them; that it is enough that they can tell this holy Oraiſon to be appointed for us to call upon God in all our deſires: more than this is not neceſſary, ſay the Rhemiſts, * and that the principal efficacy of Common Prayer

* *Suarez. de orationc. l. 3. c. 4.*

* *Annot. in* 1 Cor. 14.

Prayer consisteth specially of the very virtue of the work (and what is that but the bare repeating of the words themselves?) and of the publick office of the Priest, as the Rhemists further instruct us in their notes on that Chapter. He that considers the great precept of their Church, that is, hearing of Mass, and how much Religion they place in that duty, would think, surely they are bound to mind what is said, and understand what he is speaking; but even this is not necessary in their judgements and practice; for a man may read on his book, and yet satisfie this precept of hearing Mass; a man may be saying his Beads in a corner, and know not one word that the Priest said, and yet still satisfie this precept; a man that stands so far off from the Priest, that he cannot hear and understand the words, yet if by rising up, kneeling or otherwise, he dees either actually or virtually wish that the Priest who speaks for all may be heard of God, this suffices; * and says he, no man is bound by the precept of hearing Mass to hear the

* Ambrosius man. Conf. ss. c. 21. n. 8.

words, much leſs to underſtand them. Further, a man may talk and chat and yet attend enough, for this is ſufficient ſays *Filliucius*,* *ſi confabulatio ſit diſcontinua*, he may jeſt and droll, talk *de re levi* and yet hear maſs; this is their common doctrine. But now by taking away the neceſſity of attention, and underſtanding what they ſay, by reſtraining the Service to a tongue they underſtand not, and pretending that the efficacy of Common Prayer depends on the publick Office of the Prieſt, they ſtill ſtrive to magnifie the Clergie and make the people depend wholly on them.

* *Caſ. Conſc. tom. 1. tr. 5. c. 7. n. 216.*

5. The ſame is evident alſo from the doctrine of Confeſſion: They tell us, that it is not enough that men confeſs their ſins to God, or that they be really and heartily ſorry for them, or that they effectually forſake them, but they muſt confeſs their ſins to the Prieſt, either actually if they can have a Prieſt, or at leaſt in deſire; that they muſt confeſs every mortal ſin with the circumſtances of it, ſpecially thoſe which change the kind

kind of the ſin, and without the Prieſts abſolution no pardon from God; if the Prieſt does not abſolve them, then they are not abſolved in Heaven, and what's all this but to oblige the people to a greater reverence of the Prieſt, and dependance on his authority?

In the practice of forbidding the Laity the Cup, one reaſon ſtill is for fear of equalling the people to the Prieſt; the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation ſtill has an aſpect this way, to procure reverence to the Prieſt. This is a priviledge beyond mans invention, ſays *Ruſhworth*, and ſuch as if all the great wits who ever lived ſince the beginning of the world, ſhould have ſtudied to raiſe, and magnifie ſome one ſtate of men, to the higheſt pitch of reverence and eminency that could be imagined, they could never have (without ſpecial light from Heaven) thought of any thing comparable to this. And he tells us in the ſame Chapter, that Chriſt not unmindful of his Miniſters, left to them not only the Churches pomps and ſolemnities, but ſpecially

Dialogue 1. *ſ.* 5.

cially the Sacraments to advance their credit and authority. The doctrine of the propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and dead ſtill looks at the Prieſts power and profit. If the Sacrifice be availeable for the dead, then it extends the Prieſts power to the other world; if it be a Sacrifice which may be applyed according to the Prieſts intention, and every one receives benefit from the Maſs ſaid for them, according as the Prieſt ſtrongly applyes it to them, then ſtill it makes more for the Prieſt: and the better he is paid, he will help thoſe for whom he is paid with a ſtronger thought and more intenſe application. Their doctrine of intention in the Sacraments ſtill increaſes the Prieſts power, and the peoples dependance on them; by this means they make the efficacy of the Sacrament wholly depend on the Prieſts pleaſure. If the Prieſt pleaſes he may turn all the Bread in a Bakers Shop into Chriſts body (that is) if he will ſay over it *hoc eſt corpus meum*, and intend to Conſecrate it; or if he pleaſes he may make the Hoſt, though he does

ſay

ſay over it *hoc eſt corpus meum*, ſtill to be no more than bread, becauſe he does not intend to Conſecrate, and he may make the people worſhip they know not what. The doctrine of private Maſſes plainly has the ſame deſign, for they tell us 'tis a Sacrifice as well as a Sacrament; and though as to the Sacrament they require that ſome ſhould communicate, yet as to the Sacrifice there is no neceſſity, for the Prieſt may ſay a Maſs for ſuch a perſon or for ſuch a purpoſe, though none Communicate; but ſtill then this is for the Prieſts profit, for they perſwade the people that the eternal puniſhment due for ſin is changed into a temporal by the power of the Keys in the Sacrament of penance; that this temporal puniſhment muſt be endured either here or in Purgatory; that they can take off this temporal puniſhment by applying to them the merit of Chriſt in the Sacrifice of the Maſs; and therefore the more Maſſes are ſaid for them, the likelyer way either never to come into Purgatory, or get quick riddance thence: but ſtill the Prieſt gains

by

by this. And if I ſhould run through other doctrines of that Church in which we differ, I could ſtill ſhew the ſame tendency. And now it is much to be feared, where power and greatneſs, riches and ſecular advantages are ſo plainly deſigned by the frame and nature of thoſe Doctrines they profeſs, leſt they only be the fruit of ambition and covetouſneſs.

If any will obtrude on us a Religion, 'tis reaſonable that we ſhould firſt conſider what advantages they propound to themſelves, and if the doctrines they require us to believe tend mainly to advance their own profit or greatneſs, we have reaſon to ſuſpect, they come not from God. No wonder if men cry up a Religion which makes for their own end; and are zealous for thoſe doctrines which ſerve to raiſe themſelves. And this is the caſe here; many doctrines of the Romiſh Church, are plainly ſquint-ey'd: and though they pretend to be the truths of Chriſt, yet have a ſtrange aſpect on the Prieſts advantage. It has been the great policy of the Romaniſts to interweave

weave their own profit and ſecular advantages with their Religion; ſo that by obliging the Conſciences of their followers to own thoſe doctrines as articles of faith, they oblige them to promote the ſecular greatneſs and power of the Clergy. Now this I look on, if not as a neceſſary Argument, yet as a probable motive to diſſwade men from returning to the Communion of the Romiſh Church. For ingenuous perſons will hardly like thoſe who ſpeak for their own ends, or turn to that ſide where a main buſineſs of their Religion is to advance the Prieſts power and the Popes greatneſs.

FINIS.

BRITISH MUSEUM
27
83
APR